





Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division

SCB

Section

11176

Number



A SECOND TRUE
DEFENCE ^{2:6:}
OF THE MEER
Nonconformists,

AGAINST THE
Untrue ACCUSATIONS, REASONINGS and
HISTORY of Dr. EDWARD STILLING-
FLEET, DEAN of St. PAULS, &c.

Clearly proving that it is (not sin but) duty

- 1. Not wilfully to commit the many sins of Conformity.
- 2. Not Sacrilegiously to forsake the Preaching of the Gospel.
- 3. Not to cease publick worshipping of God.
- 4. To use needful Pastoral helps for salvation, though men forbid it, and call it Schism.

Written by RICHARD BAXTER, not to accuse others, but to defend Gods Truth, and the true way of Peace after near 20 years loud Accusations of the silencing, prosecuting Clergy and their Sons.

With some Notes on Mr. Joseph Glanvilles Zealous and Impartial Protestant, and Dr. L. Moulines Character.

1 Tim 6. 5, 6. *Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth; supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thy self. But godliness with contentment is great gain.*

LONDON: Printed for Nevil Simons, at the Sign of the Three Golden Cocks at the West-end of St. Pauls. 1681.

Church, but such of them as were capable, by continued owning their Baptismal Covenant, not nullified by proved Heresie, or inconsistent wickedness. And they held, that no unwilling person was capable of a sealed Pardon of sin, and so of Church-Communion, nor yet of the true receiving of the use of the Pastoral office: And therefore that none but *free Consenters* should have the Sacrament, nor be related to the Pastor, as his Flock of that Church: but the rest should be constrained to live as Catechumens, or Hearers, as they were capable, in peace and quietness (and such as the Magistrate found meet to be tolerated in other Churches, who only were incapable in that).

2. They were so far for Presbytery, as to hold, that 1. If men of competent sufficiency, were made by ordination Elders, *ejusdem ordinis* with the chief Pastor, to be his Assessors and Assistants, though they seldom, or never Preached publicly, but helped him in Catechizing, or private oversight, and in judging persons and cases; and though in necessity they laboured with their hands, it would not be unlike the ancient Government. 2. And they judged, that all Gods work should be done in the greatest concord, and with the best mutual counsel and help that might be; and therefore that Synods are to that end of great use: and if they were appointed at stated times and places, it would by order, be a furtherance to their ends: But they were not for their assuming a proper Regent Power, by Majority of Votes over the *minor* part, or the absent Pastors; and thought that when fixedness occasioned that usurpation, occasional Synods *pro re natâ*, were better. And 3. They judged, that Presbyters are *ejusdem ordinis* with Bishops, and that no Bishops have a divine right to govern without the Presbyters assistance, nor to deprive them of any of their power, nor their Churches of true Discipline or Worship, nor the people of their Rights; much less to use any forcing power of the sword on any.

3. They were so far for Episcopacy, as to hold it lawful, and convenient, that the particular Churches have one that shall have a Priority, and in many things a Negative Vote, as the Incumbent

bent in each Parish hath among his Curates a sort of power. And that the Presbyteries and Synods have their Moderators; and if they were fixed *durante vitâ*, and had a Negative Vote in Ordinations, they could consent; sobeit they were duly chosen as of old, and had no forcing power by the sword, but only a Ministerial, teaching, guiding power. And some of them thought it of Divine right, that the Apostles and Evangelists have Successors in the ordinary parts of their office; and that to have a special care of many Churches, and their Bishops and Elders are some of that ordinary part.

4. And to the *Eraſtians* also they granted, that the King is the Supreme Governour of the Church, by the sword, or force; and that we must obey him, not only when he enforceth the Commands of Christ, but in all acts of outward circumstance and order, left by God to his determination, and not appropriated to the Ministers office. These were the thoughts then of the far greatest part of the Ministers that I had then knowledg of.

¶ 2. Before the King returned, many Episcopal Doctors and great men, perswaded these Reconcilers, that thus much would be accepted to our common concord, if the King were restored: But some said, They do but decieve you; there are such men now got into chief credit on that side, that will silence you all, and ruine you, unless you will follow *Grotius*, or be of the French Religion, or unite in the Pope, as *Principium unitatis*, and obey him, as the *Western Patriarch*, &c. And when you are all turned out, what men have they to supply your places?

¶ 3. But when the King came in, and encouraged the Reconcilers with the promise of his help, they made the attempt in 1660, and 1661. the History of which I need not repeat, Since that foreseeing what the silencing of so many Ministers, and the afflicting of the people of our mind would unavoidably cause, we pleaded, we petitioned the Bishops to have prevented it, by those necessary means which they might have yielded

to, to their own advantage: But it was all in vain.

§. 4. When the Act of Uniformity came out, of about 9000 Ministers that kept in, and had laid by the Liturgy before, about 7000 Conformed (to the altered Liturgy, before any of them ever saw it, save a few) by declaring their *Assent* and *Consent* (the Act being known before the Book could be Printed:) and about 2000 were silenced by that Act. How they behaved themselves since then, is so well known, and I have here, and oft declared; and how the Plague first, and the burning of the Churches next, and the Kings Licenses next, did give them the opportunities and calls which made more publick Preaching seem to them a duty, that I shall not make recital of it.

§. 5. All this while abundance of investitures were poured out against them, by many of the Conforming Clergy, in Prefs and Pulpits; and especially in the ears of great men, to whom we had no access, but seemed what such men described us to be. The new Laws against Conventicles, and the *Oxford* Act of Confinement had been added to the first: Many were hunted up and down, their Goods and Libraries distrained; many were imprisoned; some there died: The Informers and Prosecutors grew weary: They saw the severity came most from the Prelates, and the Parliament, the King being not for severity therein: The Justices grew unwilling of Execution; the Preachers reprove them, and call on them to put the Laws in Execution; they are greatly offended at the Kings Licenses; they continue to accuse us for Schism at least, and some of Sedition; though we invaded none of their Temples, nor askt them for any part of their maintenance. And the Parliament and Prelates were so sharp against us, that we durst not tell the world *what we refused in Conformity*, and *why*, lest we put them upon more severity; nor indeed *could we do it*, the Prefs was lockt up by so great penalties. But while we were forced to silence, we were lowdly called to, to say *what we stuck at*, and *what it was that we would have*. And
after

after 17 years such calls, I ventured to name the things; and hence is the storm of the present indignation.

§. 6. I had before proved the wilful desertion of our Ministry, especially when the King Licensed us, to be odious Sacriledg: To this I am told, of mens power to silence such as they think deserve it: I grant it, if they truly think so: so may they on just cause alienate Churches, and Church-lands, and hang Malefactors: but not when no such cause is given, nor at their pleasure.

§. 7. When in the first *Plea for Peace* I had stated the case of our Nonconformity, I intended to bring the Proofs of each particular supposed sinful, as I after found occasion. And meeting with abundance that accused us of disloyal, rebellious Principles, I largely delivered my own, and many others judgment of Civil and Ecclesiastical Authority, the power of Princes, and the duty of Subjects; and therein also wrote some Answer to Four Accusations brought against us. 1. That we pretend Grace against Morality. 2. That we hold, that things Indifferent became unlawful, if commanded. 2. I largely confuted Bishop Morley's false Accusation of my Doctrine, of the Magistrates power to command things unlawful by accident; and Dr. Parker's Doctrine of Scandal. 4. I confuted them that extend our Nonconformity to things which we refuse not. All this in the *second Plea for Peace*; which none yet, that I know of, have answered.

§. 8. And lest any should think that we are all for Negatives, I wrote a Treatise of the *only Terms of Universal Christian concord*, which I value above all the rest, being assured that the Churches will never otherwise be healed, than by that impartial, sure, and easie Catholick way, which some have reviled, but none since, that I know of, confuted. One Learned Bishop (that had a chief hand in our present Impositions and ejection)

I de-

I desired to tell me, *which is the way* of Christian concord, if this be not : And he maintaineth, That *the only way is to obey the Colledg of Pastors, who are to govern the Catholick Church through all the world, per Literas formatas.* Where this Colledg, as one governing power do meet, or how they signifie their Majority of Votes, and in what cases, and who must gather the Votes (from *Abassia to Moscovie*), and in how long time, and how *they* shall come to all men with certainty ; and whether the ejected, silenced, and excommunicated, &c. may appeal to them, &c. I could not learn.

§. 9. In the same Book I sufficiently confuted Mr. *H. Dodwell's* great Book, which denyeth not only the Churches and Ministry, which are not by uninterrupted Episcopal Ordination, but also the ordinary salvation of all such Churches, as having no covenant promise, by valid Sacraments delivered them. He hath pretended some defence in a late Book of Letters: to which, if they can be Printed, I hope to give easily a satisfactory reply.

§. 10. In the same book he Publisheth some old Letters of his to me, for the Diocesan frame of *Government* ; *the notice of which beforehand* given me, caused me to Publish a *full Treatise of Diocesan Episcopacy*, containing the Reasons why we cannot swear to it, or approve it, or swear never to endeavour any reforming alteration of the frame here settled, and exercised. And whatever Mr. *Dodwell* pretendeth to the contrary, if this Treatise do not fully answer his Letter, and justify us in this part of Nonconformity, I am unable to judg of the Cause, but am willing to recieve any better information.

§. 11. And because I find false History, not the least cause of ordinary mistakes, and men cry up Diocesan Prelacy, as the ancient, and chief cure of Schism ; I gathered an Abstract of the history of Bishops, and their Councils, that the true matter of fact might not be so commonly mistaken as it is.

§. 12. At

§. 12. At the same time came out against me, First, a book of Mr. *John Cheyneys*, the mistakes of which I manifested in an Answer: And after ward old Letters of Mr. *Hinkleys*, to which I had an old Answer, which I cast by, and now Published: and another Accuser, abounding with untruths, called the *Impleder*; and another called *Reflections*, or *Speculum*, &c. And another Book of Mr. *Cheneys*, full of most pitiful mistakes; All which, with Justice *Roger L'Estrange's* Dialogue, and some others, I answered together in a Book called the *Third Defence of the Non-conformists*, &c.

§. 13. But the Accusations of Dean *Stillingfleet* in his Sermon, made the loudest noise: In the Answer to which, I chiefly desired to have come to some understanding agreement with him, about the true state of our Case and Controversie; and to that end, craved his answer to several necessary questions; but was not able to procure it. And now in his large Book, where I hoped to have found an Answer to them, I look for it in vain. Yea, though Mr. *Hikeringhill* roughly provoked him but to expound his own Text, and tell us intelligibly, what *the same Rule* is, which the Apostle would have all walk by, he will not do it; but instead of that, with unusual gentleness tells me, he will *not differ about it*, if I do but grant, that it is a *Rule that binds us all to do all that lawfully we can for peace*, which I cheerfully grant; And if it be *not lawful* for peace and concord to forbear silencing us, imprisoning us, accusing us as odious for not wilful sinning, and urging Magistrates to execute the Laws against us, and making us seem Schismatics for not forbearing to Preach the Gospel, to which we were vowed and consecrated by Ordination; I know not lawful from unlawful: I cannot yet get him to tell us, what he would have the many score thousands do on the Lords Days, that have no room in the Parish-Churches; with many such, which our case is concerned in.

§. 14. I thought his Book had been an Answer to mine, and other mens Prefaces; but I find that I was mistaken: Indeed he nameth five Books written against his Accusation: what he saith to Dr. *Owen*, and Mr. *Alsop*, I leave to themselves to consider of: The

Countrey Gentlemans Case, in sense, was this, *Whether all they that think Parish-Communion, under the present impositions, to be sin, are bound, till they can change their judgment, to forbear all Church-worship, and live like Atheists, and so be damned?* And who can find any Answer to this?

Mr. Barret's Queries out of his Books, he saith, next nothing to, but a dark retracting his *Irenicon*: And far be it from me to blame him for growing wiser. But why took he no notice of his own words, cited in the Epistle, out of his late Book against Idolatry, threatening us all with no less than damnation, if *we prefer not the purest Church*.

And as to my *Defence*, his Book is nothing like an Answer, unless his naming me, and citing out of that, and other Books, a few broken scraps, which he thought he could make some advantage of, may be called an Answer.

§. 15. I confess he hath made some attempt to tell me *what the National Church of England is*; but so Independently, as I doubt his party will disown it with great offence. In short, he holds, that there is no such thing as a Church of *England*, in the usual Political sense, having any Constitutive, Ecclesiastical, Supreme Power, Monarchical, or Aristocratical, or Democratical, but it's only the many Churches in *England*, associated by the common consent in Parliament, &c. Remember that he and I are so far agreed.

As I was writing this, I saw a Book against him of a friend, too much for me, and somewhat freely handling the Dr. which in this point would help them, by saying, that the *Convocation having the Legislative Church-Power, may be the Constitutive, Regent part*: But he confesseth to me, that he spake not *what is*, but *what he counts should be, or wisheth*; for the Dr. himself had before told us, that the Convocations of *Canterbury* and *York* are *two*, and not united to make *one National, supreme power*; so that this proveth *no one political Church of England* at all, but only 2 Provincial Churches in *England*!

§. 16. The Dr. hath so judiciously and honestly pleaded our Cause in his defence of A. Bishop *Land*, and his Book against Idolatry, that I have made his words the first Chap. of this Book, which if he candidly stand to, I see not but our principles are the same.

§. 17. His

§. 17. His book is made up of 3 parts. I. Untrue Accusations. II. Untrue Historical Citations (abundance). III. Fallacious Reasonings.

Would you have an undeniable Confutation, *ad hominem*, in few words?

I. As to his *Principles*, he saith himself as aforesaid, *Of Idolat. p. 7. We are sure that wilful ignorance, or choosing a worse Church before a better, is a damnable sin.*

II. As to his History of the old *Nonconformists*, read A. Bishop *Bancrofts* dangerous Positions, and *Heylins* History of Presbytery, charging them odiously with the clean contrary, and the Canons made against them on that supposition.

III. As to his History, and Doctrine against the Election of Bps, which I pleaded; (as I have fully proved his abuse of History in it,) I repeat Mr. *Thorndikes* words, *Forbear. of Penalty. It is to no purpose to talk of Reformation of the Church to regular Government, without restoring the liberty of choosing Bishops, and priviledg of enjoying them to the Synods, Clergy and people, in the making of those of whom they consist, and by whom they are to be governed, that I need make no other reason of the neglect of Episcopacy, than the neglect of it.*

O pray hard to God to provide greater store of skilful, holy and peaceable Labourers for his Harvest, that by the sound belief of a better world, have overcome the deluding love of the honours, prosperity and pleasures of the flesh, and wholly live to God and Heaven.

P O S T S C R I P T.

DR. *Edward Stillingsfleet Irenic. P. 114. saith*, The Episcopal men will hardly find any evidence in Scripture, or in the practice of the Apostles, for Churches consisting of many fixed Congregations for worship, under the charge of one Pastor; nor in the Primitive Church, for the Ordination of a Bishop, without the preceding Election of the Clergy, and at least, consent and approbation of the people; and neither in Scripture nor Antiquity, the least foot-step of the delegation of Church-power; so that upon the matter all of them at last make use of those things in Church-Government, which have no other foundation but the principles of humane prudence, guided by Scripture; and it were well if that were observed still.

P. 370. Surely then their Diocesses were not very large, if all the several Parishes could communicate on the same day, with what was sent from the Cathedral Church.

P. 361. I doubt not but to make it appear, that *Philippi* was not the Metropolis of *Macedonia*, and therefore the Bishops there mentioned could not be the Bishops of the several Cities under the jurisdiction of *Philippi*, but must be understood of the Bishops resident in that City.

P. 157. There must be a form of Ecclesiastical Government over a Nation, as a Church, as well as of Civil Government over it as a Society governed by the same Laws.—For every Society must have its Government belonging to it, as such a Society: And the same reason that makes Government necessary, in any particular Congregation, will make it necessary for all the particular Congregations, joining together in one visible Society, as a particular National Church: For the Unity and Peace of that Church ought much more to be looked after, than of any one Congregation.

P. 131. The Churches power, as to Divine Law, being only directive and declarative; but as confirmed by a Civil Sanction, is juridical and obligatory.

P. 113. Where any Church is guilty of corruptions, both in Doctrine and in practice, which it avoweth, and professeth, and requireth the owning them, as necessary conditions of Communion with her; there a Noncommunion with that Church is necessary, and a total and positive separation is lawful and convenient.

P. 117. Where any Church retaining purity of Doctrine, doth require the owning of, and conforming to any unlawful, or suspected practice; men may lawfully deny Conformity to, and Communion with that Church in such things, without incurring the guilt of Schism.—P. 119. Let men turn and wind themselves which way they will, by the very same argument that any will prove separation from the Church of *Rome* lawful, because she required unlawful things as Conditions of her Communion; it will be proved lawful not to Conform to any suspected, or unlawful practice, &c.—They lay the imputation of Schism on all them who require such Conditions of Communion, and take it wholly off from those who refuse to Conform for Conscience sake.

A Pre-

A Premised explication of the Equivocal word *CHURCH*.

THE word [*CHURCH*] being Equivocal, is unfit for our disputation, till explained: It signifieth (being a Relative) several sorts of related Assemblies: which are distinct. I. In their Matter: A Church of Jews, Turks, Christians, of Orthodox, and of Hereticks, being not one thing.

II. In the Efficient: A Church of Gods instituting, or a Church of mans.

III. In the Ends. 1. A Christian Assembly at a Fair, or Market, or Court, or Army, &c. is not the same with an Assembly for Religious exercises. 2. Nor an Assembly for Legislation about Religion (in Parliament), or Consultation in Synods, or Disputation in Schools, the same thing as an Assembly for stated worship. &c.

IV. In the Form, or Constitutive Relation to the Correlate: And so the great difference which now concerneth us to note is, that a Church of Equals in Office and Power is one thing, and a Political Society, related as Governours, and governed, is another.

The first is either an accidental Assembly, or else a designed Assembly by consent.

This last is either an Assembly of Lay-men, which may be agreed hereafter to come under Government; and may meet to worship God without a Pastor; and this in Politicks is usually called, a meer Community. 2. Or an Assembly of Rulers or Pastors in equality (as to Government there): And this is called, a Council, Synod, Dyet, Parliament, Convention, &c.

V. A Governed. or Political Church is of Three several Species (at least) as there are three Species of such Government.

I. A Christian Family, consisting of the Family-Government, and Governed, living together in holy faith, love, worship, and obedience to God; the Master being their Teacher, Ruler, and Guide in worship.

II. A Pastoral-Church, consisting of one, or more Pastors, and Christian people correlated as his flock, for the benefit of his Pastoral-office, which essentially containeth a power to teach them, lead them in worship, and govern them by the Keys, as a Ministerial Judge, who is fit for that Communion. All together is called also, the Power of the Keys, and is subordinate to Christs Teaching. Prietly, and Ruling Office.

III. A Royal, or Magistratical Church, consisting of a Christian Sovereign, and Christian Subjects, to be ruled by his sword, or forcing power under Christ, and his Laws, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the society, and the glorifying, and pleasing the Lord-Redeemer.

And

And IV. The Universal Church comprehendeth all these three as parts, and is most excellently, properly, and fully called, the Church, consisting of Jesus Christ the chief Pastor (Teacher, Priest, and King, an eminent perfect Policy) with all Christians, as the subject part: It is visible in that the subjects, and their profession, and worship are visible; and Christ was visible on earth, is visible in the Court of Heaven, his Laws, and Providence are visible, and he will visibly judge the world, and reign for ever: And it is no further visible. The constitutive, essential parts, are only Christ and his subject-body: The noblest, organical parts of that body, are Propheets, Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers.

In all this, note 1. That we have no difference, that I know of, about the Church in any of these senses before mentioned, except,

1. How far men may invent Church-forms for Gods service (without Gods particular prescript, or institution).

2. Whether it be true, that the King is so persona mixta, as some hold, as to be King and Priest, and to have the power of Church-Keys, and Word, and Sacraments.

3. Whether over and above the lowest Pastoral Churches Christ hath instituted a direct, superior Pastoral sort of Churches, to rule the inferior, in Faith, Worship, and the Keys of Discipline, over Pastors and people? And if so, what are these superior Pastoral Churches, whether Diocesan, Provincial, National, Patriarchal, Papal, or all? And if Christ made no such, whether men may make them?

2. And note, that we are certainly agreed, that the Magistratical form of forcing power, and the Pastoral form of Sacerdotal power of the Keys, are two, though the subjects should be the same (though usually the Church is in the Commonwealth, as part): And none of us deny a Christian Commonwealth, Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical; and though this power be over the Pastoral Church, it is but Accidental, and not Essential to it.

3. And note, that the chief questions which I put to the Dr. about this, were,

1. What is the Pastoral specifying form of the Church of England? And

2. Whether it be of Divine or humane Institution: And I have brought him to maintain, that there is no such Church of England at all. And of the Royal Church or Kingdom we are Members as well as he.

4. And Lastly, Note, that as to a Pastoral Church, we agree, I suppose, in distinguishing a Transient, and a fixed relation. And as he that is a Licensed Physician, acteth as such where he cometh, though related fixedly to no Hospital; so if a lawful Minister of Christ, either fixed in another Church, or in none but the Universal, be called, pro tempore, for a day, to do his office in another Church, he acteth as Christs Minister, and their Pastor for that day: And if a travelling Christian joyn with them, he is a Member for that day:

Yea,

Yea, if the whole company intend to meet but that one day in the same relations, to the same ends, it is a temporary, transient Pastoral Church. But fixed Inhabitants for order and edification, ought to fix their relation and practice.

Though most of this be said after, where he calls me to it, I thought meet here to premise the Explication of the word [Church] (as in divers books largely I have done of the word [Separation]) lest I imitate him in leaving my explication to the hinder part, and we should dispute about a word, which the Reader, and perhaps our selves understand not.

But we have a greater controversie than this, risen since A. Bishop Laud's, and Grotius's Reconciling design, v. z. what the Catholick visible Church is?

1. Protestants have hitherto held, as the first point of difference from the Papists, that the Universal Church hath no constitutive Head, or supreme regent Power but Christ. He hath settled no one, Vicarious, or deputed supreme, Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical.

2. Accordingly they noted the difference of two sorts of Papists, some that set the Pope as superior, above Councils; others (as the Councils of Constance, and Basil, and the French, that make the General Council supreme, the Pope being President, as the chief of the Patriarchs, and having many priviledges, as Primate to the Universal Church.

3. But that in truth, the Catholick governing power of Pope, and the other four Patriarchs, was but a humane form of Church Policy settled in one Empire as a National kind of Church, and the Councils were Universal as to the Empire, but not to all the Christian world (which I have proved against W. Johnson fully) called by the Emperour that had no power over other Nations, and subscribed by his subjects.

4. That the grand cheat that hath set up Popery, is the turning this National Church into an Universal Government of all the Christian world; and pretending that Christ, or his Apostles set up that power over all, which Emperours, and Imperial Councils set up only over one Empire.

5. We are sworn against Forreign Jurisdiction by the Oath of Supremacy. For the Roman Empire is dissolved, and if it were not, we are no subjects of it.

6. Yet we hold that all Christians should live in all possible love and concord, counselling, and helping one another for the edification of the Church; and that such Councils are useful thereto, as may be had without more hurt than good. But that no Universal governing power besides Christs (for Legislation, Judgment, or Execution) is needful to that concord; nor is a Government of the whole Christian world by any one Political supreme, Pope or Council, or Colledg of Pastors, or Cardinals, any more possible or lawful to be sought, than that all the Kingdoms on earth have one humane civil Sovereign; though all Kings, as well as all Bishops, are bound to serve God with the greatest concord that they can attain.

But now he that will read many late Divines of England, will find, that they are come to this. 1. To take the foresaid Conciliar, and French Papists to be no Papists; and so to make it a controversie, *de nomine* (in which, for me, let them have their liberty). 2. To take it for a necessary thing, to believe that the Universal Church in the world hath one supreme governing power under Christ, and is a Society, that is, therein visibly one. And 3. That this one ruling power is either a General Council, or the Colledge of all Bishops on earth. 4. And that the Imperial Church-form was, and is to be the true Universal Church form, viz. a General Council, where the five Patriarchs are by themselves, or by consent. 5. And that the Pope is President, and Principium unitatis, and chief Patriarch, and so to be obeyed by us. 6. And that there is no true way to Universal concord but by being of this one Church, so formed, and obeying its Universal Laws, which they say, Christ hath given them power to make. 7. And that they are Schismatics, and not to be tolerated that do not so consent and obey. 8. Yea, say some to us in England, it is compelled obedience to all the present Impositions, which only must cure our divisions, without abatement for Union, or any Tolerations.

A great deal more of this nature is built on this principle, that the Church in all the earth is one, as under one humane supreme Government, under Christ, and that all are Schismatics that are not of it, and obey it not. I am not for disgracing any by the name of Papists that refuse it; whether the French, and the councils of Pisa, Constance and Basil shall be called Papists I contend not: But whether those false principles be the only terms of concord, wise men will cautelously consider.

ADVERTISEMENT.

There is lately Published a Book of the same Authors, called, *A Search for the English Schismatick*, by the Case and Characters 1. Of the *Diocesan Canoneers*. 2. Of the *Present Meer Nonconformists*. Not as an Accusation of the former, but a necessary Defence of the latter, so far as they are wrongfully accused and persecuted by them. And is to be sold by *Nevill Simmons*, at the Sign of the *Three Golden Cocks* at the *West-end* of *St. Pauls*.

T H E C O N T E N T S.

A *N Historical Preface : Dr: Stillingfleet's judgment as in his Irenicon.*

A Premised explication of the equivocal word Church. What the Catholick Church is in our judgment, and what in the judgment of many of our silencers.————

Chap. 1. *Dr. Stillingfleet's large and plain Asserting of our principles in his Defence of Archbishop Laud, and Rom. Idolatry.* p. 1.

Chap. 2. *Some Animadversions on his Preface : Whether the Jesuits first brought in Spiritual Prayer. A full explication of our judgment about Spiritual Prayer. His hard terms against mens (high or low) chusing Tutors for their Children.*———— p. 11.

Chap. 3. *Dr. Stillingfleet his Accusations examined : His confusion ; disputing a question not stated : What he means by [Our Church] by [Communion] by [Constant] by [Withdrawing] by [Separate Congregations] what Separation I am for or against. Whether he say true, that my Tremendous aggravations of the sin of Conforming were written without the least provocation on their part : or that as designed to represent the Clergy as notorious Lying perjured Villains,* p. 22. &c.

Chap. 4. *His false History of the old Nonconformists : as if Bancroft's Danger. Posit. Heylin, and all such old accusers, utterly belyed them, and the Canons made against them had a false supposition : his citations examined : More proof of his falsification : The difference between the Nonconformists and the Brownists. How we are used by them. The Reformatio Legum Eccles. how much for discipline. I now add my request to the Reader that would know how far the first Reformers were of the Nonconformists mind, and against our new Church-men, that they would but read Cranmers, and the other Drs. words cited by Dr. Stillingfleet in the end of his Irenicon (and left out of Dr. Burnet's History) and Bu-*
†
cer's

The Contents.

cer's Scripta Anglicana, De Regno Dei, his Censura of the Liturgy, & de cura Anim. &c.

The story of Dr. Ames, Paul Bayne, Dr. Fulk, &c. Dr. Humphrey's Letter to the Bishops, ————— P. 55, 56, 57.—

Chap. 5. *The false Reasonings and accusations of his second part,* p. 59. *My judgment and case stated, which he falsely reporteth: Others Cases considered Whether it be true, That there is no other reason against Communion than was at the first Reformation. Difference proved, 1. From the things imposed. 2. From the design of the imposers. 3. From the effects. 4. From the case of the Church with whom we Communicate. 5. From the additional reasons for our Preaching,* p. 64. *What he would have them do that cannot have room in their Churches,* p. 70. *His appeal to my case at Kederminster, shamed,* p. 71, &c. *His false supposition that most of my Hearers need not our Teaching, because they sometimes hear in the Parish-Churches,* p. 73. *He acquits them from Schisme that separate, if the Church be Schismatical,* 74. *(I desire the Reader then to Read my few Sheets, called A search for the English Schismatick.) More mistakes.* p. 74, 75.

Chap. 6. *Whether he be no Christian, that is not a fixed Member of a particular Church? The Doctors Schismatical Error Confuted,* p. 76. *(He by this condemneth Apostles, and Evangelists that were Itinerant and unfixed, such as Bucer de Regno Dei would have sent abroad) my exceptions about Churches and Ministers justified, and his Calumny detected,* p. 80. *Whether I give too much to the People, or am against the Rights of Patrons, or Magistrates,* p. 82. *Many more Calumnies to* p. 89. *He accuseth, me, as accusing them for naming the sins that I dare not commit,* p. 89. *More of his vain Accusations to* p. 92. *Whether he be for silencing us* p. 92. *More of his Calumny,* p. 99. *Considerable Quere to him,* p. 94. *How he would drive men to Separation,* p. 95, 96. *He is come to Self-condemning Gentleness, in expounding his Rule and Text,* Phil. 3. 16. p. 97. *His sad Ennumeration of the causes of just Separation,* p. 98.

Chap. 7. *He begins his Third Part with more false Accusations,* p. 99. *His History for Diocesan Churches against Parochial found fallacious,* p. 100, &c. *His vain Plea for the English Frame,* p. 106, &c. *He saith, Its probable while the Apostles lived there were no fixed Bishops, or but few,* p. 103. *(And Dr. Hammond saith, No Subject Presbyters) whether John Fox were the Publisher (or Prefacer) of the* Re-

The Contents.

Reformatio Legum, &c. p. 109. Discipline hard, but not unnecessary
77, p. 111.

Chap. 8. *What the National Church of England is, fully discussed; and the Doctors Self contradictions detected: He denyeth any true Political Church of England: He and we more agreed, than he and other high Church-men, that are for a Constitutive Political Government, p. 112, 113, &c. He maketh it an introduction of Popery, to hold that a Church must have a Constitutive Regent Church-power; and so fasteneth Popery on the Masters of his cause.*

Chap. 9. *That the mutual Consent of Pastors and flock is necessary to the very being of their Relation. About Thirty Proofs from Antiquity, that the Universal Church was for about 1000 years of that mind, and decreed it, p. 128, &c. The necessity of consent proved from the Nature of the work; where the reasons of it are all plainly opened p. 133, &c. The Doctors contrary surmises and false Histories fully confuted, p. 136, &c.*

Chap. 10. *Of the imposed Use of the Cross in Baptisme, and denying Baptisme to the refusers. p. 153. His vaine excuses confuted. Whether the Cross be used as a Sacrament. His disingenuous falsifying my words of the use of Crucifixes and other Images, p. 156, &c. What the Papists ascribe to Sacraments: p. 168.*

Chap. 11. *Whether the Excommunicating Church, or the Excommunicate Nonconformists, for not Communicating, when ipso facto Excommunicate, be guilty of Schisme. p. 163.*

Chap. 12. *Of the English sort of Sponsors, and the Exclusion of the Parents Duty. p. 167. (see more in the Postscript)*

Chap. 13. *Of the three French Letters which he subjoyneth. p. 171.*

Chap. 14. *Epistles and Testimonies, Compar'd with the Doctors. And notes on Mr. Jo. Glanvilles Book, called The Zealous Impartial Protestant: With a Letter of his to the Author; and a Digression about Dr. Lewis du Moulin, his Published Picture and Death-bed Repentance.*

The Contents.

A Postscript, of five notices, viz.

1. *Of a new Observation of the Trade of taking mony to be Godfathers to Poor mens Children, and missing Baptisme for want of mony.*
 2. *A Letter of Mr. W. Rathbands, of his Fathers judgment and Practice.*
 3. *An Excellent Confutation of Dr. Stillingfleets History, of the extent of Dioceses, and Choice of Bishops, fully proving, that the old Bishops were Parochial or Congregational, and always chosen by the People, or not made theirs without their free Consent. By a Learned and faithful Minister.*
 4. *An Excellent Vindication of the silenced Ministers, by a Conformist, &c.*
 5. *My Apologie for the Nonformists Preaching, Written by me, and Comming out with this.*
-

E R R A T A.

IN the Preface, Sect. 17. line 13. read *pleaded for*. l. 17. after *Clergie and People*, add *of each Diocefs*. So Evident is the right of Synods, Clergie and People.

A N

A N S W E R

T O

Dean S T I L I N G F L E E T S, &c.

C H A P. I.

The Concord of Dr. Stillengfleet and the Nonconformists, especially with the Principles of my Book of Church Concord, about the true Nature of Schism, and who is the Schismatick: written by him at age in his most owned books, and not in youth in his Irenicon: I stand to all my words against Schism which he hath cited, and so I doubt not but he stands to these following of his.

D *Iscourse of Idolatry of Rome, p. 7.* ‘[Though we know not what allowances God will make for invincible ignorance, we are sure that willful Ignorance or CHOOSING A WORSE CHURCH BEFORE A BETTER IS A DAMNABLE SIN and unrepented of destroys Salvation.

The Papists consent, p. 43. ‘[I agree so far with him, that every Christian is bound to choose the Communion of the purest Church: but which that Church is, must be seen by the grounds it brings to prove the Doctrines it teaches to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles. That Church is to be judged purest that hath the best grounds, and consequently it is of necessity to Salvation to embrace the Communion of it.

Pag. 194. 195. ‘[1. The Churches power is only to Edification and not to destruction: For this was as much as the Apostles challenged to themselves; and I hope none dare challenge more: But this is a principle of Natural reason, that no power in a society ought to be extended

'beyond the benefit of it, or to contradict the end and designe of it. 2.
'The Apostles were the most competent Judges of what made for the Edi-
'fication of the Church.]

Pag. 216. 217. ' [1. It is agreed on both sides that the Scriptures do
'containe in them the unquestionable will of that God whom we are
'bound to serve, and it being the end of devotion (as it ought to be of our
'lives) to serve him, what is there, the mind of any one who sincerely de-
'sires to do it, can be more inquisitive after or satisfied in, than the rules
'God himself hath given for his own service. Because it is so easy a mat-
'ter for men to mistake in the waies they choose to serve him in : I see the
'world divided more scarce about any thing than this: Pag. 218. Can
'any man imagine a better way, if it could be hoped for, than that God him-
'self should enterpose, and declare his own mind, according to what way
'they ought to serve him ! And this is acknowledged to be done already by
'all Christians in the Scriptures, and after all this must not all persons con-
'cerned be allowed to enquire into that which is owned to be the will of God,
'or do they think that ordinary people that understand not Latine and
'Greek ought not to be concerned what becomes of their Souls ? If they
'be and do in good earnest desire to know how to please God and serve
'him, what directions will they give him ? *They must do as they are bid-*
'*den*] true, say they, if we were to worship you for Gods, we would do
'as you bid us : for we think it fitting to serve God in his own way : But
'we would know whether that God whom we serve, hath given us any
'Rules for his worship or no. How shall we know whether we keep them
'or not, or will you take upon you the guilt of our sins in disobeying his
'will ? This seems to be a very just and reasonable request, and I fear it
'will one day fall heavy on those who conceale that which they confess to be
'the will of God, from the knowledge of the people.

Pag. 548. [I agree with him in the way of proof of a Churches purity,
'viz. by agreement with the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and that
'the Church is to be judged purest, which shews the greatest Evidence of
'that consent, and that every one is bound to enquire which Church hath
'the strongest motives for it, and to embrace the Communion of it.

Pag. 565. ' [14. To suppose the books so written to be imperfect, *i. e.*
'that any thing necessary to be believed or PRACTISED are not con-
'tained in them, is either to charge the first Author of them with fraud,
'and not delivering his whole mind, or the writers with insincerity in
'not setting it down, and the whole Christian Church of the first ages
'with folly, in believing the fulness and perfection of the Scriptures in
'order to Salvation.

Read the rest of those excellent Rules to the end.

In his excellent, Vindication of Arch Bishop Laud, called A Rational account of the Protestants Religion, he hath the same termes of Communion and the same description of Schism with mine, and I know not how better to express my thoughts, nor plead my Vindication, viz.

Page. 289. ‘[In his defence of Arch Bishop Laud (not yet disowned) since so great, and considerable parts of the Christian Churches have in these last ages been divided in Communion from each other, the great contest and enquiry hath been which party stands guilty of the cause of the present distance and separation. For both sides retain still so much of their common Christianity as to acknowledge that no Religion doth so strictly oblige the owners of it to peace and unity as the Christian Religion doth; and yet notwithstanding this, we find these breaches so far from closing, that, supposing the same grounds to continue, a reconciliation seems to humane reason impossible, an Evidence of which is, that those persons who either out of a generous desire of seeing the wounds of the Christian world healed, or out of some private interest or designe, have made it their business to propound terms of reconciliation between the divided parties; have been equally rejected by those parties they have professed themselves the members of.]

Page. 290. ‘[The distance then being so great as it is, it is a very necessary enquiry what the Cause of it is, and where the main fault lies: and it being acknowledged that there is a possibility that corruptions may get into a Christian Church, and it being impossible to prove that Christianity obligeth men to Communicate with a Church in all those corruptions its communion may be tainted with, it seems evident to reason that the cause of the breach must lie there, where the corruptions are owned, and imposed as conditions of communion. For can any one imagine it should be a fault in any to keep off from communion, where they are so far from being obliged to it, that they have an obligation to the contrary from the principles of their common Christianity? And where men are bound not to communicate, it is impossible to prove their not communicating to be Schism. For there can be no Schism; but where there is an obligation to communion; Schism being nothing else but a willful violation of the bonds Christian communion. And therefore whenever you would prove the Protestants guilty of Schism, you must do it by proving they were bound to communicate with your Church in those things which they are Protestants for disowning of, or that there is so absolute and unlimited an obligation to continue in the society of your Church, that no conditions can be so hard, but we are bound rather to submit

to them, then not joyn in Communion with you.

' This being a matter of so vast consequence in order to the settling mens minds in the present disputes of the Christian world, before I come to particulars, I shall lay down those general principles which may manifest how free Protestants are from all imputation of Schism. Schism then importing a violation of that communion which we are obliged to the most natural way for understanding what Schism is, is to enquire what the foundations are of Christian communion, and how far the bounds of it do extend. Now the Foundations of Christian communion in general depend upon the acknowledgment of the truth of Christian Religion. For that Religion which Christ came to deliver to the world being supposed true, is the reason why any look on themselves as obliged to profess it; which obligation extending to all persons who have the same grounds to believe the truth of it, thence ariseth the ground of society in this profession, which is a common obligation on several persons joyning together in some acts of common concernment to them. The truth then of Christian Religion being acknowledged by several persons, they find in this Religion some actions which are to be performed by several persons in society with each other. From whence ariseth that more immediate obligation to Christian society in all those who profess themselves Christians; and the whole number of these who own that truth of Christian Religion, and are thereby obliged to joyn in society with each other, is that which we call the Catholick Church. But although there be such a relation to each other in all Christians as to make them one common society, yet for the performance of particular acts of communion, there must be lesser societies wherein persons may joyn together in the actions belonging to them. But still the obligation to communion in these lesser is the same with that which constitutes the great body of Christians, which is the owning Christianity as the only true Religion and way to eternal happiness. And therefore those lesser societies cannot in Justice make the *necessary conditions of Communion narrower* than those which belong to the *Catholick Church*, i. e. those things which declare men Christians ought to capacitate them for communion with Christians.

' But here we are to consider that as to be a Christian supposeth mens owning the Christian Religion to be true, so the conveyance of that Religion being now to us in those books we call the Scriptures, there must be an acknowledgment of them as the indispensable rule of faith and manners, which is, that these books are the great Charter of the Christian society according to which it must be governed.

' These

‘ These things being premised as the foundation in general of Christian society, we shall the better understand how far the obligation to communion in it doth extend. For which it must be considered that the grounds of continuance in communion must be suitable and proportionable to the first reason of entering into it. No man being obliged by virtue of his being in a society, to agree in anything that tends to the apparent ruin of that society: But he is obliged to the contrary, from the general grounds of his first admission into it. His primary obligation being to preserve the honour and interest of it, and to joyn in acts of it so far as they tend to it. Now the main end of the Christian society, being the promotion of Gods honour, and Salvation of mens Souls, the primary obligation of men entering into it, is the advancement of these ends to joyn in all acts of it so far as they tend to these ends; but if any thing come to be required directly repugnant to these ends, those men of whom such things are required, are bound not to communicate in those lesser societies where such things are imposed, but to preserve their communion with the Catholick societie of Christians.

Pag. 291. ‘ Setting then aside the Catholick society of Christians, we come to enquire how far men are bound to communicate with any less, society how extensive soever it may pretend its communion to be. 1. There is no society of Christians of any one communion, but may impose some things to be beleived or practised which may be repugnant to the general Foundation of Christian society.

Pag. 292. ‘ 2. There being a possibility acknowledged that particular Churches may require unreasonable conditions of communion, the obligation to communion cannot be absolute and indispensable; but only so far as nothing is required destructive to the ends of Christian Society: Otherwise men would be bound to destroy that which they beleive, and to do the most unjust and unreasonable things. But the greater difficulty lies in knowing when such things are required, and who must be the Judge in that case, to which I answer.

‘ 3. Nothing can be more unreasonable than that the society imposing such conditions of communion should be judge, whether those conditions be just and equitable or no. If the question were only in matters of peace; conveniency, and order, the judgment of the society ought to over-rule the judgments of particular persons; but in such cases where great bodies of Christians judge such things required to be unlawful conditions of communion, what Justice or reason is there that the party accused should sit Judge in her own cause?

‘ 4. Where there is sufficient evidence from Scripture, reason and
B 3 ‘ tradition

tradition that such things, which are imposed, are unreasonable conditions of Christian Communion, the not communicating with that Society, which requires these things cannot incur the guilt of Schism, which necessarily follows from the precedent grounds, because none can be obliged to Communion in such cases, and therefore the not communicating is no culpable separation.

Page 324. 'His Lordship delivers his sense clearly and fully in these Words; 'Tis too true indeed, that there is a miserable rent in the Church, and I make no question but the best men do most bemoan it; nor is he a Christian, that would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. But, I never said or thought, that the Protestants made this rent. The Cause of the Schism is yours; for you thrust us from you, because we call'd for truth. and redress of abuses. For a Schism must needs be theirs, whose the cause of it is. The *Wo* runs full out of the mouth of Christ ever against him that gives the offence; not against him that takes it ever.

Page 325. 'I do say it now; and most true it is, That it was ill done of those, who ere they were, who first made the Separation. But then *A. C.* must not understand me of actual only, but of causal Separation. For (as I said before) the Schism is theirs, whose the cause of it is: and he makes the Separation, that gives the first just cause of it; not he that makes an actual Separation upon a just Cause preceding. And this is so evident a Truth, that *A. C.* cannot deny it, for he says it is most true.

That the Reader may clearly understand the full State of this Controversie concerning Schism; the upshot of which, is, that it is agreed between both parties, that all Separation from Communion with a Church doth not involve in it the guilt of Schism, but only such a Separation as hath no sufficient cause or ground for it.

Page 131. 'There can be no Separation from the whole Church, but in such things wherein the unity of the whole Church lies; for Separation is a violation of some Union: Now when men separate from the errors of all particular Churches, they do not separate from the whole, because those things, which one separates from those particular Churches for, are not such, as make all them put together to be the whole or Catholick Church. This must be somewhat further explained. There are two things considerable in all particular Churches; those things which belong to it as a Church, and those things which belong to it as a particular Church. Those things which belong to it as a Church, are the common ligaments or grounds of Union between all particular Churches, which taken together make up the Catholick Church: 'Those

' Those things which belong to it as a particular Church, are such as
 ' it may retain the essence of a Church without. Now, I say, who so-
 ' ever separates from any particular Church (much more from all)
 ' for such things without which that can be no Church, separates from
 ' the Communion of the Catholick Church: but he that separates only
 ' from particular Churches, as to such things which concern not their being,
 ' is only separated from the Communion of those Churches, and not the
 ' Catholick. And therefore supposing that all particular Churches have
 ' some errors and corruptions in them, though I should separate from
 ' them all, I do not separate from the Communion of the whole Church,
 ' unless it be for something, without which those could be no Churches.
 ' An evidence of which, is, that by my declaring the grounds of my sepa-
 ' ration to be such Errours and corruptions, which are crept into the Com-
 ' munion of such Churches, and imposed on me in order to it, I withal
 ' declare my readiness to joyn with them again, if those errours and cor-
 ' ruptions be left out. And where there is this readiness of Communion,
 ' there is no absolute separation from the Church as such, but only suspen-
 ' ding Communion till such abuses be reformed: which is therefore more
 ' properly a separation from the errors, than the Communion of such a
 ' Church, wherefore if we suppose, that there is no one visible Church,
 ' whose Communion is not tainted with some corruptions, though if these
 ' corruptions be enjoined as conditions of communion, I cannot commu-
 ' nicate with any of those Churches, yet it followes not that I am separa-
 ' ted from the external Communion of the Catholick Church, but that I
 ' only suspend Communion with those particular Churches, till I may safe-
 ' ly joyn with them. As, suppose all the particular men I can converse
 ' with, were infected with Leprosie, my not associating with them, doth
 ' not imply that I am separated from the Communion of all Mankind, but
 ' that I am loath to be infected as they are, and therefore withdraw my
 ' self, till I can meet with such healthful persons with whom I may safely
 ' associate again. And if several other persons be of the same mind with
 ' me, and we therefore joyn together, do we therefore divide our selves
 ' from the whole World by only taking care of our own safety? And espe-
 ' cially if any company of such leprous persons should resolve that none
 ' should live among them, but such as would eat of those meats which
 ' brought that distemper upon them, our withdrawing our selves and asso-
 ' ciating without them will still appear more reasonable and commendable.
 ' Therefore we say, we do not necessarily separate from all Churches
 ' that have errors or corruptions in them, supposing those errors and
 ' corruptions be not imposed on us, as conditions of communion; and
 ' essence

thence though we should grant, no one visible Church free from taint or corruption, yet it is not necessary we should separate from them all: for we may lawfully joyne in communion with Churches having error and corruptions, if our joyning be not an approbation of them. Thus though the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Albigenses*, *Abyssins* may have some errors, or corruptions, yet if they be not fundamental, and be not joyned as necessary to be approved in order to their communion, notwithstanding them, we may lawfully communicate with them, it doth not then at all follow, that if there may be no one visible Church free from error and corruption, it would be necessary to separate from the communion of the Catholick Church: Because, 1. All those particular Churches may not make those errors conditions of communion. 2. Though they did, we separate not from them as Catholick, but as corrupt and erroneous particular Churches.

Pag. 336. 'To rectifie such gross mistakes as these are for the future, you would do well to understand that Schism formally taken alwaies imports something criminal in it, and there can be no just cause for a sin; But besides that there is that (which if you understand it) you would call the materiality of it, which is the separation of one part of the Church from another. Now this according to the different grounds and reasons of it, becomes lawful or unlawfull, that is, as the reasons do make it necessary or unnecessary, for separation is not lawfull but when it is necessary; Now this being capable of such a different nature that it may be good or evil according to its circumstances, there can be no absolute judgment passed upon it, till all those reasons and circumstances be duly examined, and if there be no sufficient grounds, for it then it is formally Schism *i. e.* a culpable separation; If there be sufficient cause then there may be a separation, but it can be no Schism. And because the union of the Catholick Church lies in fundamental and necessary truths, therefore there can be no separation absolutely from the Catholick Church, but what involves in it the formal guilt of Schism; it being impossible any person should have just cause to disown the Churches communion for any thing whose beleif is necessary to Salvation. And whosoever doth so, thereby makes himself no member of the Church, because the Church subsists on the beleif of fundamental truths. But in all such cases wherein a division may be made, and yet the several persons divided retain the essentials of a Christian Church, the separation which may be among any such must be determined according to the causes of it. For it being possible of one side that men out of capricious humours and fancies renounce the communion of a Church which requires nothing

but

‘ But what is just and reasonable : And it being possible on the other side, that, a Church, calling her self Catholick, may so far degenerate in Faith and Practice, as not only to be guilty of great Errors and corruptions, but to impose them as conditions of Communion with her, it is necessary, where there is a manifest separation, to inquire into the reasons and grounds of it ; and to determine the nature of it according to the Justice of the cause, which is pleaded for it.

Page 357. ‘ The Catholick Church therefore lies open and free, like a Common field to all inhabitants. Now if any particular number of these Inhabitants should agree together to enclose part of it without consent of the rest, and not to admit any others to that right of Common, without consenting to it, which of these two parties, those who deny to yield their consent ; or such, who deny their rights, if they will not, are guilty of the violation of the publick and common rights of the place ?

Page 358. ‘ Although nothing separates a Church properly from the Catholick, but what is contrary to the being of it ; yet a Church may separate her self from the Communion of the Catholick by taking upon her to make such things the necessary conditions of her Communion, which never were the conditions of Communion with the Catholick Church.

Page 359. ‘ Since it appears that the Communion of the Catholick Church was free for many hundred years without approving or using these things ; that Church, which shall not only publicly use, but enjoy such things upon pain of Excommunication from the Church, doth as much as in her lies draw the bounds of Catholick Communion within her self, and so divides her self from the true Catholick Church. For whatever confines must likewise divide the Church, for by that confinement a separation is made between the part confined and the other, which separation must be made by the Party so limiting Communion. As it was in the Case of the Donatists, who were therefore charged with Schisme, because they confined the Catholick Church, within their own bounds : And if any other Church doth the same which they did, it must be liable to the same charge that they were. The sum of this discourse is, that the being of the Catholick Church lies in Essentials, that for a particular Church to disagree from all other particular Churches in some extrinsical and accidental things is not to separate from the Catholick Church, so as to cease to be a Church : But still what ever Church makes such extrinsical things the necessary conditions of Communion, so as to cast men out of the Church, who yield not to them, is Schismatical in so doing ; For it thereby divides it self from the Catholick Church : And

‘ the separation from it is so far from being Schism, that being cast out
 ‘ of that Church on those terms only, returns them to the Communion of
 ‘ the Catholick Church. On which grounds it will appear that yours
 ‘ is the Schismatical Church and not ours : For although before this im-
 ‘ posing humor came into particular Churches, Schism was defined by the
 ‘ Fathers and others to be a voluntary departure out of the Church, yet
 ‘ that cannot in reason be understood of any particular, but the true Ca-
 ‘ tholick Church. For not only persons but Churches may depart from
 ‘ the Catholick Church : And in such Cases not those, who depart from
 ‘ the Communion of such Churches, but those Churches, which departed
 ‘ from the Catholick are guilty of Schism. These things I thought neces-
 ‘ sary to be further explained, not only to shew how false that imputati-
 ‘ on is, of our Churches departing from the true Catholick Church ; but
 ‘ with what great reason we charge your Church with departing from the
 ‘ communion of it ; and therefore not those whom you thrust out of Com-
 ‘ munion, but your Church so thrusting them out, is apparently guilty of
 ‘ the present Schism.

Page 366. ‘ The truth is such pretences as these are, are fit only for a
 ‘ Church that hateth to be reformed ; for if something not good in it
 ‘ self should happen in any one Age to overspread the visible Communion
 ‘ of all particular Churches, this only makes a Reformation more necessa-
 ‘ ry, so far is it from making it more disputable. For thereby those cor-
 ‘ ruptions grow more dangerous, and every particular Church is bound
 ‘ the more to regard its own security in a time of general infection. And
 ‘ if any other Churches neglect themselves, what reason is it that the
 ‘ rest should ? For any or all other particular Churches neglecting their
 ‘ duty, is no more an Argument, that no particular Church should re-
 ‘ form it self, than that if all other men in a Town neglect preserving
 ‘ themselves from the Plague, then I am bound to neglect it too.

Page 540. ‘ Every Church is bound to regard her own purity and
 ‘ peace, and in case of Corruptions to proceed to a Reformation of
 ‘ them.

Page 541. Saint *Augustine* saith not only in that place, but in very
 ‘ many others, that Saint *Peter* did sustain the Person of the Church,
 ‘ when Christ said to him, I will give thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of
 ‘ Heaven.

‘ That he did *universam significare Ecclesiam*, signifie the whole Church ; and
 ‘ that those things which are spoken of *Peter*, *non habent illustrem intellectum*
 ‘ *nisi cum referuntur ad Ecclesiam, cuius ille agnoscitur in figurâ gestasse personam*,
 ‘ have no clear sense, but when they are referred to the Church, whose per-
 ‘ son he did bear.

Pag. 542 'He means the formal right of them was conveyed to the Church, and that Saint *Peter* was only a publick person to receive them in the name of the Church.

'It primarily and formally resides in the whole body of the Church:

'Pag. 544. His Lordship saith your opinion is yet more unreasonable; because no body collective, whensoever it assembled it self, did ever give more power to the representing body of it, than a binding power upon it self and all particulars; nor ever did it give this power otherwise than with this reservation in nature, that it would call again and reform, and if need were, abrogate any law, or ordinance upon just cause made evident, that the representing body had failed in trust, or truth. And this power nobody collective, Ecclesiastical or Civil can put out of it self, or give away to a Parliament or Council, or call it what you will, that represents it.

'His Lordship saith that the power which a Council hath to order settle and define differences arising concerning faith, it hath not by an immediate institution from Christ, but it was prudently taken up by the Church from the Apostles example.

CH A P. I I.

Some Animadversions on his Preface.

§ 1. **T**HE impartial searchers after truth, have hitherto thought that a strict method (at least agreeable to natural Logick) is more effectual than confusion or wordy popular haranges: And that the controversie should be very cleerly stated before it can be profitably argued: And therefore that first all ambiguity of terms be by due explication removed, that men may not mean several things and not understand each other; and to *Define* and *distinguish* where it is needful, and then Affirm or deny, and then effectually prove. But why this worthy person doth far otherwise with us, both before and now, it is more his part than mine to give the reason: I dare not say he cannot; Nor I dare not say, he can, but will not, but all that I can say is that *he doth not*, and I know not why.

§ 2. The Preface of his Book called *Unreasonableness*, &c. Is so much answered already by Mr. *Lob*, that I will not lose time by doing much to the same again: And there is a posthumous book of Dr. *Worleys* cal-

led, *The third part of naked Truth*, which hath strenuously handled the same chief matter for Scripture Sufficiency against unnecessary Impositions. It being supposed, though not there expressed. 1. That he speaketh not against the guiding determination of undetermined accidents which must be determined one way or other: As Time, Place, Utensils, Translation-words, *Metres, tunes, &c.* 2. And that a man that intollerably breakes Gods Laws (by Blasphemy, Treason, Murder, Fornication, &c.) is not to be tollerated because he erroneously thinks he keepeth them.

§ 3. His sad saying [*that there is no improbability that the Jesuites should be the first setters up of the way in England* which he calls the Doctrine [*of Spiritual Prayer*] Mr. Lob hath opened, as it deserveth, in part; but to say all that it deserveth would seem so harsh, that I have reason to think that it would but more offend than profit him.

§ 4. For I find that he is grown too impatient with our *Nameing* what he patiently and confidently doth: The cause of his impatience I leave to himself. But that it is much within him I must conjecture, when in his defence of Bishop *Land* I read him saying to the Papists [*To speak mildly, it is a gross untruth.*] And yet when I speak not so plainly to him (and I think never more sharply) he accounts it a *continuel Passion, Rage, Railing, Intollerable indiscretion, &c.* Do I give him harder words than these? Yet I profess I smart not by them: I take them for very tollerable words, in comparison of his miscarriages in the cause in hand.

Several sorts of men I have found think other men speak in passion: 1. Those that hear and read with passion: They think that which angers them came from anger. 2. Those that are too high to be dealt with on even terms, and think the plain speech which agreeth to others is a contempt of such as them. 3. Those that commit miscarriages so gross and defend causes so bad, as have no names but what are disgraceful, and then take all that is said to anatomize their cause and errors, to be said against them selves. With these and such others, *Truth*, is not tollerable he railleth that confuteth them, and doth *Auriculas molles mordaci radere vero.* I profess I felt so little passion in writing that book which he saith was written in *one continued Passion*, that I think verily, I sinned all the while, for want of a livelier sense of the sin and hurt which I was detecting by my confutation. But I confess it is my opinion that *Falshood of Speech* may lie in describing a thing *short of Truth*, as well as in *going beyond it*: And that the *Truth of words* is their *Agreeableness* to the *matter* (and mind): And that *verba rebus aptanda sunt*: And that he that writeth against *sin* must call it sin, and open the evil of it.

§ 5. His Preface giveth us hopes that we are so far agreed in our ends,

as to be both for God, for truth, for unity and peace and Love, and against Popery, and one would think this much should go far towards our Concord. But, alas, all agree not what Piety is, or what Popery is, nor of the way to our ends.

If he think that to be against *Spiritual Prayer* would help us against Popery, 1. I would he would tell us, *which way*. If by reducing the Nonconformists to think *Formes lawfull*; so do the Jesuites: And he told us that they at *Franckford* took a Forme from *Geneva* as useful: And the present Nonconformists put their judgment out of question an. 1660, and 1661. In their writings, offers and Formes Printed. But all that are for Formes are not for all things in *your Formes*.

2. And I would he would have better told us *what the Spiritual Prayer is*, which the Jesuits first brought in and helps in Popery. For hitherto it is the *Dead Ceremonious formality and Imagery* of Popery, destroying *Spirituality*, (by words not understood, Mummeries, Beads, Canting Stage workes) which hath alienated most Religious Protestants from them. I will. 1. Tell you what I take *Spiritual Prayer* to be; and then. 2. Desire his judgment of it.

1. It is my judgment (if he know it to be erroneous, I crave his reasons) 1. That Man's Soul is by sin so depraved that it is morally unable without Gods Spirit, effectually to know, feel and desire deliverance from his own sin and misery, and to desire Gods Grace and Glory, above all worldly sinful pleasures.

2. That therefore such desires in act and habit must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God. And the whole work of Regeneration and Sanctification is a giving to the Soul that new Divine nature, Love and delight, which worketh by such holy desires. And that as the carnal mind is enmity to God, and cannot be subject to his Law, and if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of his; so to be Spiritually minded is life and peace, and God who is a Spirit will be worshipped in Spirit and truth, and by this we know that we are the Children of God by the Spirit which he hath given us; For he promised to pour out the Spirit of Grace and supplication: And because we are sons, he hath given us the Spirit of his Son, by which we cry *Abba Father*: And this Spirit helpeth our Infirmities in Prayer: If these things be in the Papists Bible, I hope they are not therefore Popery. I suppose the Papists also own our God, our Saviour and our Creed.

3. The help in Prayer which we expect from the Spirit, is. 1. To illuminate us to know what we need and should desire and ask. 2. To kindle in us holy desires sincere and fervent, of what we should ask.

3. To give us a true belief of and trust in the Love of God, the intercession of Christ and the promises of the Gospel, that we may pray in hope. 4. To give us thankful hearts for what we do receive, and sit with joy to praise the giver. 5. To stir up all these dispositions to particular acts in the due season : And to save us from the contrary. 6. And we believe that a mind so illuminated, and affections so sanctified and kindled, have a great advantage above others *ceteris paribus* to express themselves in words : For. 1. A man that *knoweth* what to say can speak it when the ignorant cannot ? Doth not a stock of knowledge enable you to Preach without book ? 2. Such a Soul will set it self diligently to think what and how to speak in so great a business, when the careless mind it not. 3. Love and delight are very speedy Learners. 4. Fervent desire sets all the powers of the Soul a work, and is full and forward to express it self. Hunger can teach men easily to beg : Poor men speak intreaties ; Anger, Joy, every passion maketh and powreth out words, where there is prerequisite ability.

4. We believe that he who by natural defectiveness or disuse cannot find words fitly to utter his own mind, may have the help of Gods Spirit in uttering such words as he readeth or learneth of others ; and (especially in the case of *Psalms* which are not of sudden invention) if for Concord the Churches agree to use the same meet words, Gods Spirit may actuate their desires thererin.

5. We hold that this Holy Spirit, is as *Tertullian* speaketh, Christs Vicar, Agent or Advocate, by preventing, operateing, Cooperating grace, thus to illuminate, Sanctific and actuate believers, in all holy works, and especially in prayer. And I could heartily wish that you would not be against so much, as *Spiritual Preaching, Spiritual Writing and disputing, and living*, and not say that the Jesuits brought them in.

6. I believe that we are Baptized into the name of the Holy Ghost as well as of the Father and the Son, believing that he is thus Christs Agent for all this work upon our Souls, and covenanting to obey him.

7. I believe that sins against the Holy Ghost, especially deriding or reproaching his great works, miraculous or Sanctifying, have a dangerous malignity.

8. I suppose that in all this, the faculties of mans own Soul are the natural recipients of the Spirits influx, and agent of the act which both causes effect : And that its as vain a question, whether it be by the *Spirit* or by *natural faculties* that we pray aright, as whether it be God as *sons nature*, or mans natural powers which cause our natural acts ? Or whether the Act of seeing be from the sun or the eye ? As if the same effect might

might not, yea must not have a Suprior and Inferior Cause?

9. Therefore as Gods Spirit witnessing with ours that we are his Children, so Gods Spirit helping our infirmities in Prayer, suspendeth not the exercise of our Spirits, or maketh our reason and consideration needless, but actuateth them in their duty. Learning and studying how to pray, is consistent with the Spirits help in Prayer.

10 I never talkt of it with any Nonconformists who denyed that an hypocrite may without any *special* help of the Spirit, speak all the same words in prayer without either book or form, wick another may speak: The help of knowledge, hearing, use and passion may help him to words: Therefore they never take a man to be proved godly or sincere, by his bare words: but by the *grace* of Prayer, which is *holy desire &c.* and not by the speaking, gift, or habit.

11. But we think that it was not the Jesuits that first said, *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*; and though the tongue may lie, it is made to express the mind, and we must judge of other mens minds by their words, till somewhat else disprove them. And its natural for the Heart to lead the Tongue. And men are more affected by words which come from affection than by those that do not: and Reading words written by another when we speak to God, is not so natural a signification of *desire* or other affection, as speaking them from the present dictate of the heart; For any Child that can read may do the one, and it is not the usual signification of seriousness in other actions. A beggar that should only read his begging lesson, or a Child or Servant that should only read some words to his Father or Master, would be thought less sensible of his wants.

12. Ministers should be men better acquainted than the people, how to *speak to God and man*: It is their office; and therefore it belongeth to them to choose the words which are fittest: and to set up a Ministry that can do neither, is to befriend the Prince of darkness against the Kingdom of Light, and to be a deadly enemy to the Church and Souls. And to set up a ministry that *need not do it*, but may *choose*, or is not obliged to it, is the way to set up a ministry that *cannot do it*. Let the Ministers be bound to no more than to *Read*, and a few years will transform them to such as *can do no more than read*. *Miscery* proveth that, and too many other Countries.

13. If it be praying freely from present knowledge and desire, without a book or set form which you call *Spiritual prayer*, either you are for the use of it in the Pulpit or not. If you are, did the Jesuits teach it you? or will you go on to follow them? If not, what a divided party

are the Conformists, while so many use it and pray spiritually? And what a Case is the Church of *England* in, that hath still so many Ministers that pray as the Jesuits Disciples? Or why do you so reproach your Church and Ministry?

14. Do you think that there is more force in the name of a Jesuit to disgrace *Spiritual prayer*, or in the name of *Spiritual prayer* to honour the Jesuits? And do you not seem to prevaricate and highly honour the Jesuits, on pretence of dishonoring *Spiritual prayer*? If you had said that the Jesuits first brought in *Spiritual preaching*, and *discourse* and *Spiritual living*, would it not have more *honoured them*, than *dishonoured Spirituality*? Will freedom from *Spiritual prayer* honour your Church? as *Seneca* thought *Cato's* name would do more to honour Drunkenness, than Drunkenness could do to dishonour *Cato*?

I am not such an Antipapist, as to fall out with Father Son or Holy-Ghost, because the Jesuits own them. You do but help to confirm my charity, who have long thought that among the Papists, there are many persons truly godly, though their education, converse, and proud, tyrannical wordly Clergy, have sadly vitiated them.

15. All prayers written or unwritten are made by some body. Those that the Bishops write down for us in the Liturgy, and for our Fasts, were made by their invention: Either they had the help of the Spirit in making them or not: If yea, then why is it not as Jesuitical to *write* a Spiritual prayer, as to *speak* one? If not, excuse them that say Gods Spirit made not your Liturgy, nor are they Spiritual prayers.

16. And were it not too like high and dangerous *Pride*, if such a one as Bishop *Bancroft*, Bishop *Laud*, Bishop *Morley*, Bishop *Gunning*, in a Convocation, or before every publick Fast, should be appointed to write the words of Prayer, and should in effect say to all the most Learned Divines in *England* [*The Spirit caused us to write these prayers, and our measure is so sure and great, that none of you may presume to question it, nor to think that you can pray Spiritually in any words of your own, but only in ours, at least in the Assembly. The Spirit will help you if you say our words, but not your own.* It now cometh into my mind what may be some of the meaning of Bishop *Gunning's* Chaplain, Doctor *Saywell*, in his last Book, that *none hath power to ordain Bishops, but they that have power to give the Holy Ghost for the work of their Office.* It may be it is, The Holy Ghost to write Doctrine Sermons and Prayers for all their Clergy to use. But do you not say also to the Presbyters *Receive the Holy Ghost*? If they have him, why cannot they speak their own hearts in other words than yours? Is Spiritual prayer appropriated to your Liturgy, words or forms, any more than

than at the Council at *Trent* he was to the Popes instructions.

17. We all confess, that as all the actions of imperfect men, have their imperfections, so have all our prayers, and these are easily aggravated: Sudden free prayer, and book prayer, have both their conveniencies and inconveniencies: The question is which *hic & nunc* hath the greatest, and whether forbidding either be not worst of all: I have named the conveniencies and inconveniencies of each in my Christian Directory.

18. Experience telleth the world, that the daily saying over only the same words, and that read out of a paper imposed by others, by one that no further sheweth any sense of what he doth, is not so apt as more free and well varied words in season, to keep people from sleepy senseless prophanation, and praying as the Papists do with their Masses, Rosaries, and Beads: And the variety of Subjects preached on, and variety of occasions, and all accidents require some diversification of words and methods.

19. It is a work of reverence to speak to the King; yet as it is lawful to write a Petition to him, so to speak to him without Book. Judges have serious work to do, for estate and life, and yet they are trusted to speak without prescribed words; and so are Advocates, Lawyers, Ambassadors, Physicians, Philosophers, and all men in their Professions, except Ministers and Christians, as such.

20. We know not why men may not be intrusted to speak to God in the name of imperfect man without imposed books and words, as well as to speak to man from the most perfect God and in his name; in preaching. Mans actions will be like man. Nothing that is not divine and spiritual should be spoken as from God and in his name. And as after our frustrated Treaty for Concord 1661. one of them (nameless) wrote a Book against free praying without an imposed form in the Pulpit, and yet they never durst forbid it to this day; so I know who shewed his desire of a new Book of Homilies (of his own making its like) to have been imposed instead of preaching, and of the old ones, on those that had not special license to preach. But interest ruleth the world: They durst not so far disgrace their Clergy, as to make them meer Readers, nor lose the advantage of talking out of the Pulpit for their Cause, where none must contradict them.

Mr. *Lob* hath ask'd you already; whether our *Spiritual Prayer*, as you call it, or your Liturgy (and Bishop *Cousins*, and Dr. *Taylor's* Prayer-books, &c.) be liker to the Popish Mass book, and many other Offices and Devotions? Indeed Mr. *Austins* hath so much gravity, as excepting his ex-

cursions to Saints, &c. it may compare with many of yours.

And for that sort of spiritual Devotion, in which they flie too high, I have found more of it in the Friers, Franciscans, Benedictines, &c. such as *Barbançon*, *Benedictus de Benedictis*, &c. than in the Jesuits: And the Oratorians, *Phil. Neri*, *Baronius*, and the rest; and of their sober or Religious men, as *Sales*, *Mr. Renti*, &c. and of old, *John Gerson*, *Kempis*, &c. have more of spirituality than the Jesuits. But enough of this.

§ 6. As to the rest of his Prefatory discourse of the Advantages of Popery. 1. We doubt not but the Papists play their game among all Parties, as far as they are able, and put on divers sorts of Vizors. But doth he (that is a Historian) not know, that all over the world their cheif design is upon the Rulers and Leaders, and they Cry, *Fight neither against great or small*, but to win one Court Card signifieth more than many others?

2. Doth he think the Papists take the Conformists or the Nonconformists to be nearer to them, and less against them?

3. Did the Papists think Bishop *Lauds* reconciling design described by Doctor *Heylin*, (entertained by *Sancta Clara*, *Leander*, &c.) or the Parliaments fears of his introducing Popery in those times, to be more against them?

4. Are they liker to help in Popery, that are so apt to be over-averse to any thing that savours of it, in Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, and account the Pope Antichrist? Or they that hold as followeth. 1. (As *Grotius*) That a Papist is but one that flatters the Popes, as if all were just that they say and do (and so there are few Papists I hope in the World.) 2. That the Church of Rome is sound in Faith. 3. And so are all the General Councils, even Trent. 4. That Rome is the Mistress of all Churches; or as Bishop *Brombal*, that for Concord we must all obey the Pope, as Patriarch of the West, and Principium Unitatis Catholicæ, ruling according to the old Canons, (a Foreign Jurisdiction) and all those pass for Schismaticks, that refuse it (of which more after.) 5. That the validity of our Ministry must be proved by the derivation of it from the uninterrupted succession of the Roman Ordainers and Church. 6. That the Church of Rome by that succession is a true, though faulty Church of Christ, but so are none of the Reformed Churches which have not Bishops, or have them not by such uninterrupted succession. 7. That the only way of the Concord of Churches and all Christians is (saith Bishop *Gunning*) to obey the governing part of the Church Universal, is which Collegium Pastorum, all the Bishops of the universal Church, in one Regent Colledge, governing all the Christian World per literas formatas. 8. That its safer and better for the Protestants in

France to be of the *French* Church of Papists than to continue without Bishops as they are. 9. That we should come as near the Papists as the *Greek* Church doth, or as both *Greek* and *Latin* did at the rupture of the two Churches, or as in *Greg.* 1st. daies say others, or as in *Char. Mag.* daies, say others; receiving say some the first six General Councils, say others the first 8. 10. That we must amend the Oath of Supremacy for the Papists, as *Thorndick* saith, and so many Doctrines as he intimateth. 11. That its desirable that the Papists had continued in our Churches as in the beginning of *Queen Eliz.* And if they come (as Church Papists do) should be received in our Communion. 12. That if the Pope have not (as some hold) a right of such Primacy as belongs to *Saint Peters* successor, at least, His Primacy is a very prudent humane constitution. 1. That there may be a Common Father to care for all the Church. 2. And one to be a Head of Unity and order. 3. And one to call General Councils. 4. And one to rule between when there are no such Councils (which are rare). 5. And one to give power to Patriarchs and Arch-Bishops who else will have none over them to authorize, or Govern them. 6. And one to decide controversies, when Countries, Churches and Arch-Bishops disagree. 7. And one to send out Preachers among Heathens, Infidels and Hereticks, all over the world. 8. And one boldly to reprove, admonish and, if need be, excommunicate Kings, which their own subjects dare not do.

I do not mean that all these things or any of them are the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, or held by all or most that conform. But if some of it have been published by the Chief Prelates, and some by their chief defenders, and some in conference with us by Clergy men, I only ask whether all this please not and advantage not the Papists, more than Nonconformists any way do? And whether Arch-Bishop *Usher* and his Successor Arch-Bishop *Brombal*, Bishop *Downam* and his Successor Bishop *Taylor* differed not as much as you and I do? And whether the multitude of Parish Priest that were Papists in *Queen Elizabeths* daies, and Bishop *Godfrey Goodman* a Papists Bishop of *Gloucester*, with all the rest mentioned by *Prin*, *Rushworth*, *Burnet*, &c. tell us not that the Papists had a hopeful game to play among the Bishops and Clergy of the Church?

§ 7. As to his note out of Mr. *Jo. Humpheries* book, disclaiming Cruelty to Papists, its known Mr. *Humphery* is a man of latitude and universal Charity, and tyeth himself to no party or any mens opinions: He openly professeth his hope of the Salvation of many Heathens, and I so little fear the noise of the censorious, that even now while the Plot doth render them most odious, I freely say. 1. That I would have Papists used like men, and

no worse than our own defence requireth : 2. That I would have no man put to death for being a Priest : 3. That I would have no writ *de excommunicatio capiendo*, or any Law compel them to our Communion and Sacraments. For I would not give it them (if I knew them) if they came.

§ 8. As to his Accusation of my first *Plex for Peace*, he hath it after, and it is alter answered. And as to his Accusation of my book for *Concord*, I answer. 1. Is it no Ministers work, in a contending world, to tell and prove what are Christs ordained termes of Christian Concord, but his that is [*Christs plenipotentiary on Earth, and were to set the termes of Peace and War*] Is this spoken like a peace maker and a Divine ? Doth not he pretend also in his way to declare the terms of Concord ?

2. But no man more heartily agreeth with him in lamenting the state of the Church on earth, that when such men as Bishop *Gunning*, Dean *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Saywel*, &c. on one side, and such as I and many better men on the other side, have so many years studied hard to know Gods will, I am certain for my self, and I hope it of them, with an unfeigned desire to find out the truth what ever it cost, (and I profess as going to God, that would he but make me know that Popery, silencing Prelacy, imprisoning, Banishing, or ruining all Nonconformists, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Quakers, or any that ever I wrote against, are in the right, I would with greater joy and thankfulness recant and turne to them, than I would receive the greatest preferment in the land) I say, that yet after all this we should so far differ, as for one side to be confident that the others way of Concord is the ready way to ruin, wickedness and confusion, and to come to that boldness to proclaim this to the world, alas how doleful a case is this ?

What hope of Christian peace and concord when such excellent sober well studied men as they, quite above the common sort, not byassed by honour, or preferments or power, by Bishopricks, Deaneries, Masterships, plurality, or love of any worldly wealth, and such as we that study and pray as hard as they to know the truth, are yet confident to the height that each others termes of Love and peace, are but Sathans way to to destroy them both, and introduce (as Dr. *Saywel* saith Conventicles do) Heresie, Popery, Ignorance, Prophaneness and Confusion : And what we are past doubt that their way will do, experience saith more than we may do.

Oh what shall the poor people do in so great a temptation !

§ 9. But I must pass from his Preface, where I have noted. 1. That he is yet so peaceable as to propose some sort of abatements for our Concord :

cord ; that the benefit may be *sibi & suis*, not reaching our necessities , but much better than nothing.

2. That they are so ill agreed, that Bishop *Gunnings* Chaplain writeth, against it, making the only way of Peace to be by the sword to force all men to full obedience to their Lordships in every thing enjoined, not abating an Oath, a Subscription, a Covenant, a Word, a Ceremony, without Comprehension or limited Toleration.

3 And I could wish the Doctor would consent, at least that Lords and Parliament men may have the liberty themselves of educating their own Sons, so it be in the Christian Reformed Religion, and to choose their Tutors, and not confine them to Conformists only : The Papists are tolerated in choosing Tutors for their Children : The King of *France* hath not yet taken away this liberty from the Protestants : Nor the Turks from the Greeks : And must you needs take it away from all the Lords , Knights, Gentlemen, Citizens, and Free-holders of *England*. Perhaps Beggars will consent, if you will keep their Children, or do what the Godfathers vow. Most Gentlemen, that keep Chaplains, expect that they teach their Sons at home, sometime at least ; what if a Lord or Knight have such a Chaplain as *Hugh Broughton*, or *Ainsworth*, or as *Amisus*, *Blondel*, *Salmatius*, as *Gataker*, *Vines*, *Burges*, &c. must the Law forbid them to read Hebrew, Philosophy, or Divinity to their Sons ? I doubt you will scarce get the Parliament hereafter to make such a Law to fetter themselves, lest next you would extend your dominion also to their Wives as well as Sons , and forbid them marrying any but Conformists.

Is it not enough to turn us all out of the publick Ministry ? Methinks you might allow some the Office of a School-master, or Household Tutor, or Chaplain under the Laws of Peace ; unless the Sword be all that you trust too : If it be, it is an uncertain thing : The minds of Princes are changable, and all things in this World are on the Wheel : when *Peter* flieth to the Sword, Christ bids him put it up, for they that so use it perish by it : Hurting many, forceth many to hurt you, or to desire their own deliverance, though by your hurt.

C H A P. III.

*The beginning of the Doctors unreasonable Accusations examined :
His stating of the Case of Separation.*

§ 1. **T**His much instead of an intelligible stating of our Controversie he giveth us, Page 2. [*By separation we mean nothing else, but withdrawing from the constant Communion of our Church, and joyning with Separate Congregations, for greater purity of worship, and better means of Edification.*] And may we be sure by this, that we understand the difference.

1. Whether by [*Our Church*] he meant the Parochial Church, (and if so, whether some or all) or the Diocesan Church; or the Provincial, or the National, or all I know not. But I know well, that some withdraw from some Parish Churches which joyn with others. And some think they withdraw not from the Diocesan or Provincial, if they communicate with any one Parish Church in the Diocess: And some renounce the Diocesan Church, which constantly joyn with the Parochial: And for the National Church, who can tell whether we have Communion with it, till we know what they mean by it? Indeed in the latter part, (after the long dispute) he condescendeth beyond expectation to explain that term; But its so as plainly to deny that there is any such thing as a Church of England in a Political sense, that hath any constitutive Regent part: But even there so late he maketh it not possible to us to know, whether we be members of the Church or not: For he maketh it to be but all the Christians and Churches in the Kingdom joyned by consent exprest by their Representatives in Parliament, under the same civil Government and Rules of Religion (Doctrine, and Worship, and Government) 1. As it is a *Christian Kingdom*, we are sure, that we are members of it. 2. As it is all the Churches of the Kingdom consenting to the Scriptures, yea, and to Articles of Doctrine, and all that Christ or his Apostles taught, we are sure that we withdraw not from it: 3. But if every Chancellor, Dean, Commissary, Surrogate, &c. Or every forme or word or Ceremonie be essential to their Church, we cannot tell who is of it and who not? Or really whether any reject not some one forme, word or office? If every such thing be not essential, he never in all the book tels us what is, or how to know it, or who is of it.

§ 2. And the word [*withdrawing*] seemeth to imply former Communion: And if so, he maketh all the Anabaptists, Independants, Presbyterians, &c. Who never were of their Church, to be none of the Separatists here meant.

But if by [*withdrawing*] he mean [*not joyning in Communion*] either he meaneth in the whole Communion or but in part: If the whole, then the many thousands that live in the Parishes and Communicate not in the Sacrament are no members of the Parish Church. And who knoweth then who are of their Church? And how few in many Parishes are of it, that yet pass for Members of the Church of England? And yet I that joyn with them am none of it, in their account.

And. 3. What meaneth he by [*Constant Communion*] I go to the Parish Church when sickness hindreth not, once a day; I go to the Sacrament, and am none of their Church. Thousands go but rarely, and thousands scarce at all, at least to the Sacrament, and these are of their Church and no separatists.

4. But perhaps the conjunction is explicative [*and joyn with separate Congregations for greater purity*, and Edification: If so, then he that never joyneth with them nor any other is none of the intended separatists. 2. Nor he that goeth to other Churches on other account; than for *purity of Worship and Edification* (As Papists that go as to the only true Church for the Authority).

§ 3. But the utter ambiguity is in the word *separate*; And that you may understand it he explaineth it by repeating it. By *separation* he means *withdrawing to separate Congregations*. But the doubt is, *which* are the separate Congregations. I named many sorts of Lawful and unlawful separations, but he will not tell us which he meaneth by any intreaty.

§. 4. I would my self yet that I may be understood, tell the reader what sorts of separation I renounce and what I own: But I have done it so oft and largely, that I am ashamed to repeat it, as oft as mens confusion calls me to it. The reader who thinks it worth his labour, may see it done in my first *Plea for Peace*, and in the Preface to my *Cath. Theol.* and specially in the beginning of the third Part of my *Treat. of Concord*, and in *Christ. Direct.* And he calls me here afterward to the same

Certainly it is only *sinful separation* that is in the question; and as certainly there are many sorts not sinful. I am locally separate from all Churches save that where I am. I morally separate from the Roman Church as an unlawful Policy, and all other which are *in specie* against Gods word: I separate from some for Heresie as being not capable matter of a Church, while they own not all the Essence of Christianity. I separate from some

as imposing sin, and refusing my Communion without it. I separate from some as having no lawful Pastors; some being incapable matter, and some, being usurpers that have no true call: I separate from some only so far as to prefer a better *rebus sic stantibus*; sometime a better as to the Doctrine, sometime as to the Worship, sometime as to the Discipline sometime and mostly as to the Pastors worth and work; some go from their own Parish, because the Minister is very ignorant in comparison of another to whom they go: some that hear the Minister preach against preciseness and for Ceremonies, had rather hear another that calleth them to holiness: some that have tollerable Preachers go to Doctor *Stillfleet* and Doctor *Tillotson* as better: some go for nearness to another Church. Some go from their own Parish because the Minister cuts the Common-prayer too short, and Preacheth too long; some because they would have it so, go to such: some because the Parson is an Arminian; others because he is contrary. Some go to the Minister that is strict in keeping the scandalous from the Sacrament: some therefore go from him: some remove their Dwellings or Lodgings for these ends; and some do not: some go from their own Parish for the benefit of the Organs in another. And of old, when Nonconformists had Parish Churches and used some part of the Liturgy, many went to them from their own Parishes. Some of these are lawful, some are unlawful: Most certainly they that go from their own Parishes, yea, or to Nonconformists Assemblies, in *London*, go not all on the same account: Nor doth the Doctor and such other separate from me as I am said to do from them, but otherwise and much more.

§. 5. If he would first have told us what *Separation is sinful*; secondly, and then have proved us guilty of it, instead of the confused talk of *Separation*, and a begging the question by suposing that to be sinful, which he will neither discribe, nor prove such, it had been of some usefulness to our conviction. But I confess I never liked those Physitians who give their Patients the Medicines that they are best stored with, or they can best spare, be the disease whatsoever; Nor the disputer that poureth out what he is best furnished to say, how uselessoever to the reader or to the Cause. Disputeing should not be like boys playing at *Dust point*, who cover their Points in a great heap of Dust, and then throw Stones or Cudgels at it, and he that first uncovereth them wins them. Dusty heaps of ambiguous words confusedly poured out, befriend not Truth that should be Naked, nor the reader.

§. 6. Some thought it was the *Place* called *Conventicle houses*, which made the Conformists call us *Separatists*; and they got oft into Parish Churches and Chappells. But these were made the worst of separatists,

and

and punished the more. And doublets it is not meeting at any of the new Tabernacles, nor at the *Spittle*, nor at *Sturbridge Fair*, where Preaching hath long been used, nor in a Prison nor at the Gallows to Prisoners and People, which are faulty Separation.

§. 7. Some thought that they meant that its want of the Common-prayer that maketh us Separatists; and they have tryed and read the Common-prayer in their Assemblys: But these have been accused and suffered the more. And even Mr. *Cheny* was forced to fly his Country for reading it, and Preaching in an unlicensed meeting. And some reading more and some less, by this it will not be known who are the Separatists; The old Nonconformists in their Parish Churches read some more, some less, and now some Conformists vary. They say a Conformist at *Greenwich* keepeth up a Common-prayer Conventicle; some Conformists are accused for overpassing much: One lately suspended for wearing the Surplice too seldom, and refusing to pray for [*our gracious Queen and James Duke of York.*] How much of this goeth to make a Separatist?

§. 8. Some thought it was want of the Magistrates leave that made them call us separatists: But when the King Licensed us, the accusation was the same: yea Mr. *Hinkley* and many others tell you, that they took this for worst of all.

§. 9. Some say it is want of the Bishops Licence: But as Mr. *Tho. Gouge* hath his University Licence, and I have Bishop *Sheldon's* Licence (I think not invalidate) and yet this goeth for no justification of us; so is it with others.

§. 10. Some think that it is a Conventicle as described by their Canon that must make us Separatists, which is of *men that call themselves of another Church*. But that's not it: Mr. *Gouge*, Mr. *Peole*, Mr. *Humphrey*, and my self, and abundance more that never gathered any Church, nor called our selves of any other then their own, are nevertheless separatists in these mens account.

§. 11. They that remembred what was called *Separation* in *England* of old, supposed it had these two degrees, which made men called Brownists. First falsely taking the Parish Ministers and Churches for no true Ministers and Churches of Christ, and therefore not to be Communicated with. Secondly or (in the lower rank) falsely taking the faults of the Parish Ministers and Churches to be so great, that its a sin to have ordinary Communion with them. But they that have still disclaimed both these are *Separatists still* in our Accusers sense.

§. 12. Some thought that *ordinary Communicating* in the Parish Churches and pleading for it, would prove us no separatists with them. But this

will not serve as my own and many other mens Experience proveth.

§. 13. I am called after to say more of this: The sum of my separation is this. First that I take not the Parish Churches to be the only Churches that I must Communicate with, and will not confine my Communion to them alone, as if they were a sect, or All: But will also have Communion with *Dutch, French* or Nonconformists.

2. I take not the Order, Discipline and mode of worship in the Parish Churches, nor the Preaching of very many Parsons, Vicars and Curates, to be the best and most desirable.

3. I take those to be no true Political Churches, which have no Pastors that have all the Qualifications, and Call, and Authority, which is Essential to the Office; and therefore can communicate with them, but as with a flock without a Pastor, or an Oratory, Community or Catechized Company.

4. I live peaceably under such Bishops as have many hundred Parishes, and no *Episcopos Gregis*, true Bishops and Pastoral Churches under them, as they think: But I own not their Constitution.

5. I joyn with all the Churches in *England* as Associated for mutual help and Concord in all that the Scripture prescribeth, and in all the Protestant Religion, and all that all Christian Churches are agreed in, and all that is truly needful to the ends of Christianity: But not absolutely in all, which their Canons, Liturgy &c. containe: Especially their *sinful Impositions*, and their Presumptuous *Canonical Excommunications* of dissenters *ipso facto*.

6. I am one of the Christian Kingdom of *England*, as under the King according to the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy; and am for obeying the Laws and Rules in all things lawfully belonging to their Power to command. But not for obeying them in sin, against God, nor for believing all to be Lawful because they command it; nor for their taking down *Family Government* or *self Government*, and discerning private Judgment of the subjects. This is my measure of separation.

§ 14. And I think in cases that concern our own and many mens Salvation we should have leave freely to speak for our selves; and not be used as we are, that must neither be endured to be silent, or to speak. Let this Dr. open our case to you himself, saith he [Pref. p. 36. Speaking of my first Plea for Peace [*As though it had been designed on purpose to represent the Clergy of our Church as a Company of Notorious, Lying and Perjured Villains for Conforming to the Laws of the Land and orders established among us: For there are no less than thirty tremendous aggravations of the sin of Conformity set down in it and all this done without the least provocation given on our side*] And elsewhere

where he saith he shall *less regard my aggravations.*

Ans. 1. If I do that which you think as bad, I would gladly be told of it (though false accusations I desire not) And impenitence is too soon learnt without a Teacher or Academical degrees, and I had rather be saved from it. 2. But Reader I once more appeal to the Judgment of all reason and humanity as well as Christianity, to decide the case of this Accusation.

1. We did in, 1660. and 1661. All that we were able by labour petition and yielding as far as we durst for fear of sin and Hell, to have been united and lived in Church Concord with the Episcopal party.

2. When our labour and hopes were frustrate and two thousand of us cast out of the Ministry, and afterwards laws made against us as Conventiclers, first for our Fining, Imprisonment, and then Banishment, and after besides Imprisonment to pay twenty pound the first Sermon, and forty pound the next and so on; when after this the Law that banished us from all Cities, Corporations, &c. and places where we lately Preached, did most deeply accuse us as the cause; I never wrote so much as the reasons of our dissent: When by the execution of these Laws we were by Informers and others used, as is well known, I was still silent. My not conforming shewed my dissent, but I durst not so much as once tell them why, lest it should more exasperate them.

3. At last I was often told that the Bishop that first forbad my Preaching, and many others after him, oft said to Great men, Mr. Baxter keeps up a Schism, and yet holds all our conformity lawful, save *renouncing a rebellious Covenant.* And I yet continued silent.

4. At last they wrote against us, that we *durst not say that any part of Conformity was sin, but only inconvenient.*

5. Then many Pulpits and books proclaim, *that we against our Consciences kept up a Schism, for a baffled cause which we had nothing to say for.*

6. All this while Lords and Commons used to ask us, *what is it that you would have, and what keepeth you from Conformity.* [In private talk, but would never allow us to speak for our selves and give the world or Parliament our reasons].

7. Many years together Pulpits and Printed Books of the Clergy, cried out to the Magistrates to execute the Laws against us, (and as one said *set fire to the Fagot*); and blamed them for not doing it.

8. When the King gave us his Licence, they were greatly offended, as afore said.

9. At last one great Bishop told me that he *would desire the King to*

constraine us to give our reasons, and not keep up a Schism, and not tell for what. And another greater told me, that the *King took us to be not sincere, that would not give our reasons.* And all this while I durst not give them, as knowing how they would be received.

10. When the Bishops kept me from Preaching and gave me leisure, I wrote. 1. An Apology for our Preaching, 2. A Treatise of Episcopacy and divers other such, and yet durst not Print them (nor indeed could do it.)

11. At last after about seventeen or eighteen years silence, by such importunity (and the Press being more open) I ventured first but to write my first Plea for Peace, which only nameth matter of Fact, and our bare Judgment, enumerating the things which we think sin, without our Arguments, lest it should provoke them more. And therein professed that (knowing mens different Educations, studies, interests, &c.) I did not by this accuse the Conformists, nor the Law makers, but only tell. 1. *What I thought would be sin in us,* 2. *And how great a sin,* if we conformed.

Reader, should I have stayed longer (the final Tract of Sacrilegious desertion of the Ministry, came out when we were licensed, but ventured not to name the matters of our Nonconformity) what could we do less? I staid till I think half the silenced Ministers were dead. Is the call of superiours, the Interest of our Ministry, and Consciences of so little regard as that I must not tell men that so loud and long had asked, *whats the matter?* Must we neither be silent nor speak?

And now see here. 1. If Dean *Stillington* be a man to be believed in such accusations, [*All this was done by me, without the least provocation on their side*] wonderful difference! Is my naming what I think God forbids me, so great a provocation to them, and is all this for seventeen years before named [*not the least provocation to us on their part?*] What shall one think could bring such a man to such a word?

2. And that which I profess that I wrote not to accuse them, he tells you was [*as if designed to represent them as a Company of notorious lying Perjured Villains.* This Collection I feared; But how could I avoid it? Must not I tell them that urge me, what sin I fear, lest they say *you represent us as such?*

3. See here how they talk of us contrarily as the *Barbarians* of *Paul*, that now make him a Murderer, and anon a God; For many years together, our Lords and Masters perswaded men that we took Conformity to be no sin, save renouncing the Covenant: And now how Contrary? Its the representation of a Company of notorious, lying, perjurer,

ed Villains, with thirty tremendous aggravations. *Repent O England,* saith *Bradford* at the stake. But who would have thought that Repentance had been so hard a work, in a case called so heynous, and that to the Preachers of Repentance, as it is either to *them* or to *us*, which ever it be that is found in the guilt.

C H A P. I V.

Of his History of the case of the old Nonconformists.

§ 1. **A**S to what he saith of the sameness of the former Case and ours, I shall tell him the difference after, where he more calls me to it; And shall shew him so much difference, as will discredit this assertion.

§ 2. As to the case of the old Nonconformists. 1. It must be premised that we take them not for any of our rule, but cleave to *Gods word* and the *example of the Primitive Church*, looking still at the great ends of order and Government.

2. We maintain as well as he that the Chief Nonconformists were against that called *Brownism* or Separation, and wrote more against it than the Conformists did.

3. I still profess my self to be of their Judgment in this, and have practised accordingly.

4. But they were not against such Preaching, or any such sort of separation as I have either practised or defended.

§ 3. Here therefore it must be known what the Controversie between them and the separatists was. 1. The higher sort of separatists said, that the Church of *England* was no true Church. The Nonconformists, said it was a true National Church both as a Christian Kingdom, and as an Association of Churches, (and as represented in National Synods were they made one.)

2. The said Brownists said that the Parish Churches were no true Churches, nor to be owned as such, nor joyned with. The Nonconformists held that they are true Churches, (that have capable Ministers) though faulty.

3. The separatists said that the Parish Ministers were no true Ministers, because ordained by Diocefans and not chosen by the people, &c. The Nonconformists said, that the capable were true though faulty Ministers,

owned by the peoples consenting communion, and the ordination valid though culpable.

4. The separatists said that Ministers and people must gather Churches that are purer, and set up better discipline in them, whatever Rulers say or do against it, or whatever they suffer, as far as they are able. The Nonconformists said, this is to be done where it may be done without doing more hurt than good, but else it is no duty but a sin, *viz.* To do it Tumultuously, Seditiously, or so as by running on the Magistrates sword, by improbable attempts to lose their own advantages for doing and getting good, and hinder the common parish reformation.

5. The Separatists said that no prohibition of the Magistrate will warrant a Minister to forbear the publick work of his office. The Nonconformists held that it belongeth to the Magistrate to restrain deceivers and all false Teachers who do more hurt than good; and such should obey when they are forbidden to Preach and Administer Sacraments: Yea if the Magistrate wrongfully forbid a worthy Minister to Preach, for order he is bound to obey, unless the need of the Church and Souls, and the probable benefit plainly weigh down that matter of order, and make the Magistrates prohibition invalid, as being against the common good, and the ends of the Ministry, and so against Christ.

6. The semi-separatists (*Robinsons party*) after held that though the Parish Churches may be called true Churches, as a Leper is a true man, and it may be lawful to hear a Sermon in them, yet the Common-prayer is so bad, and the people and Ministers so bad, and discipline so cast out, that it is unlawful to joyn with them in Common-prayer, or Sacrament, or to become settled members of them; but all must attempt, though in Foreign Countreys, that are able, to set up purer worship and discipline. The Nonconformists held that those that can have better without more hurt than good, should choote it: But they that cannot may joyn in member-ship, Common-prayer and Sacrament, with such Parish Churches as will admit them without their own actual sin, and consenting to their faults.

§. 4. I shall now give you so full proof that the Nonconformists were for more, which the Doctor calleth *Separation*, than my Preaching or practice ever reached to, as I shall tell the Reader, what credit this Doctors history deserveth, and what inhumane usuage the Nonconformists have from that sort of men.

§. 5. *Anno 1593.* Was printed against them Bishop Bancrofts book called, *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings &c. Or English Scotizing for Discipline by force &c.* In the first book he maketh their Reformations

so odious, as that Page 30. He saith that in Scotland *[it hath wrought more mischief in Thirty years, than the Pope of Rome had done before, as I think, in five hundred]* you see how that Spirit then did work, and whether our Arch-Bishop Bancroft thought better of the Presbyterian Churches or the Pope, and the Effects.

In the Second book he taketh up what rash words he could from any indiscreet men to make them odious.

In the third he sheweth what the English Nonconformists did for their Church-way and Discipline. Chap. 1. p. 42. He saith that the first Ten or Eleven years of the Queens Reign they so clamoured &c. that they divided themselves from their ordinary Congregations, and meeting in houses, woods and fields, kept there unlawful and disorderly Conventicles: and Mr. Cartwright defendeth them, saying, that the name of Conventicles was too light and contemptuous for them; Then they framed their two admonitions: In one of which p. 60, 61. They tell the Parliament that their Discipline was Gods order, and they must in Conscience speak for it, and use it. And Anno 1572. They erected a Presbytery at Wandsworth. The Elders are named. The persons named that set up meetings are Mr. Field, Wilcox, Standen, Jackson, Bentham, Sancler, Crane, Edmonds, and after Clark, Travers, Barber, Gardiner, Cheston, Crook, Egerton. Anno 1582. There was a meeting of threescore Ministers out of Essex, Cambridg-shire and Norfolk at Cock-field, Mr. Knewstubs Town. And another that year at a Commencement at Cambridge.

Chap. 3. That they drew up a book of their Discipline, where choice of Ministers, Elders, Deacons &c. are named and regulated, and for Classical, Provincial, Comitial Synods and Government. Chap. 4. He tells you how they prosecuted it Anno 1583. Out of Cholmley, Field, Fen, Wilcox, Axton, Gellebrand, Wright, Gifford. Chap. 5. How they proceeded. 1587. And 1590. Northampton-shire was divided into three Classes. First the Northampton Classis had Mr. Snape, Penrie, Sibthorp, Edwards, Littleton, Bradshaw, Lark, Flethward, Spicer &c. The Daventry Classis had Mr. Barebon, Rogers, King, Smart, Sharp, Prowdloe, Ellijton &c. The Kettering Classis had Mr. Stone, Williamson. Fawksbrook, Patinson, Massey &c. And Johnson saith it was received in Warwick-shire Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex, and most parts of England; so Smith, Hargar, Holme witness, Mr Snape said. About Braintree the Classis had Mr. Culverwel, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Gifford, (one of our Doctor's witnesses) &c. That at Colchester had Doctor Chapman, Doctor Cbrick, Mr. Dove, Mr. Farrar, Mr. Newman, Mr. Tey, &c. Page 85. Mr. Snape said, It was agreed

agreed on in the Classical and general assemblies, that the dumb Ministers were no Ministers, and that all the Ministers should Preach for the aforesaid Government.

Chap. 6. Anno 1588. A Synod at *Coventry* agreed against private Baptism, reading Homilies, the Cross in Baptism, and that the faithful ought not to communicate with unlearned (they mean uncapable) Ministers; *though* they may be present at their Service, if they come of purpose to hear a Sermon. For Laymen may read publick Service. That the calling of Bishops &c. is unlawful. That it is not lawful to be ordained by them, or denounce their Suspensions or Excommunications. That its not lawful to rest in the Bishops deprivation of any from the Ministry, except on consultation with neighbour Ministers and their flock, it seems so good to them; but that he continue in the same till he be compelled to the contrary by Civil force. &c. And the Discipline subscribed by *Cartwright, Fen, Wright, Oxenbridge, Gellybrand, Clevely, Nutter, Fetherstone, Holm, Lord &c.* To repeat all is too tedious.

But its worth the noting that whereas the Prelatists usually say, that *when they were put to draw up a Liturgy themselves, they could not agree of any*, Bishop *Bancroft* saith *Page 96.* *They offered the Parliament a book of their own, containing the form of Common-prayers &c. and hoped to have had it established.*

Page 164. Chap. 12. He tells you of their order for *Parents to offer their own Children to Baptism, and be Godfathers &c.* He proceedeth to shew that they resolved to practice their Discipline against the Magistrates will, and did accordingly. And *Chap. 15. p. 120.* That they joyned themselves into an Association or brother-hood, and appropriated to their meetings the name of the Church, thereby shewing themselves to be most notorious Schismatics, citing their words (our Churches) And *p. 121.* That the Parish where they preach assembled, is not the Church properly in their sence, but as many thereof only as are joyned to them with that inviolable bond, viz. The desire of the godly Discipline, and those furthermore who leaving their own Parish Churches come to them. e. g. *The Church of God, forsooth in Black-friars* consists besides that Parish of a number of men and Merchants wives dispersed here and there throughout the whole City. Mr. *Snape's* testimony is cited.

§ 6. By these words of *Bancroft* and the case compared, it is certain that on these suppositions many of the Canons were made against them; as against Conventicles and calling themselves another Church, and a brother-hood, and about God fathers and many more, supposing them to be of this mind.

§ 7. On supposition that these things were true, the Nonconformists have to this day been accused by those that write against them, and the testimony of this book alledged as proof. And Doctor *Heylin* hath in *folio* accordingly described them in his History of Presbytery, as many others have done.

§ 8. And now cometh Doctor *Stillingfleet*, and tells you, that [*he is certain that all the old Nonconformists*] were quite of another mind, and other men, and to prove it citeth four or five mens words against Brownists; When yet he citeth more of my own against Separation: and if my words prove me not to be against it, how will theirs prove them to be against it?

§ 9. Either *Bancrofts*, *Heylins* and such others words of them are true or false. If true, how untrue are Doctor *Stillingfleet*'s? If false, O what a sort of men were these Prelates that so stigmatized and accused and so used so many hundred such men, on so false a charge? And what a Church was it that made the Canons against them on that supposition? And how shall we know which of them to believe? Doth not Doctor *Stillingfleet* heavily reproach his own Church for such usage of them?

§ 10. The case is commonly known, First that a long time they had almost all of them Parish Churches as other men had: and they sought to set up Discipline in those Churches. And it had been folly then to gather others in other places.

2. When *Bancroft* and others had got many cast out and silenced, a great part of them kept in by connivence of some peaceable Bishops, and by the mediation of some Lords and Gentlemen, such as the Earl of *Leicester*, *Bedford*, *Warwick*, the Lord *Boroughley*, Sir *Francis Walsingham*, Sir *Amias Pawlet*, Sir *Nicholas Bacon*, Mr. *Beal*, and Sir *Francis Kneller* had been to them before: Yea the greater part of them by such favour got into privileged peculiar places, or little Chapells at least; Few Counties had not some Gentlemen that sheltered them. The Earl of *Huntington* kept in Mr. *Hildersham* at *Ashby*, Mr. *Slater* and Mr. *Ash*, even in the big Town of *Bremicham*, Mr. *Mainwaring* kept in Mr. *Ball* at *Whitmore*; Mr. *Knightley* kept in Mr. *Dod*, Judge *Bramley* (and his humble holy Lady) kept Mr. *Bramskill* at *Sheriff Hales*, and entertained many more (Mr. *Nicols* &c.) Sir *Richard Graves* at *Maseley* had Mr. *Putman* and divers others, seldom without a Nonconformist: One would think Doctor *Stillingfleet* should know that his own Patron, under whose wing he lived, Sir *Roger Bacon* was seldom without a Nonconformist at *Raxhall* in *Warwickshire*: Mr. *Hering* had long liberty at *St. Maries* in *Shrewsbury*, Mr. *Ford*

(who wrote on the *Psalms*) had the School Lecture there, Mr. *Aikins* at *Tipton*, kept in to the last, even the Lord *Dudley*, favouring him. Abundance such I might name, Mr. *Barnet*, at *Uppington* (whom I oft heard Catechize Dr. *Allestree*,) Mr. *Tandy* at *Bewdley*, Mr. *Langley*, Mr. *Paget*, Mr. *Hind*, Mr. *Lancaster*, Mr. *Rowle*, Mr. *Nicols*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Rathband*, Mr. *Barbon*, Mr. *Gee*, Mr. *Wright*, Mr. *Smart*, &c. had their liberties for some time. And when one Bishop silenced them, the next oft gave them liberty (as Bishop *Bridgman* did after Bishop *Mortons* silencing some) and when they were silenced, they went oft into another Diocese, where they rubd out a year or more, and then to another; And so were still in some hope of publick liberty.

And when silenced they used to keepe private fasts; And where they lodged to preach on pretense of expounding to as many as they could.

They obeyed the Bishops as Magistrates, but not as Pastors.

They knowingly broke the Law in their private and publick Ministry: They obeyed not the Canons; used not much of the Liturgy; And many of them did as some do now, get into publick Pulpits for a day and away, where they were not known.

§. 12. But yet there are more undeniable evidences of the falseness of what, he saith, he is certain of, as the judgment of *All the Old Nonconformists*. One is the known judgement of the Scotch Reformers, and the common accusation of the English, as being of their mind. He that will affirm that the Scotch Presbyterians thought it unlawful to preach or hold Assemblies, when forbidden by Magistrates or Prelates, will incur a very sharp censure from their own Leaders, who have written so many Books, which charge them with the contrary, and make them Rebels and Seditious for it: Such as *Bancroft*, *Heylin*, *Beziers*, and multitudes both old and new; especially these last twenty years.

And though the Nonconformists in *England* did not justify all that the Scots did (and they that took *Knox*, *Buchanan*, *Melvin*, and such other for very pious men, yet thought some words and deeds too rash, especially *Knox's* publick opening the *Queens* faults in the Pulpit, and refusing her offer to come at any time, and tell her of them privately) yet its known, that in the Rules of Discipline, they were mostly of the same judgment: And they often joyned in defending the same Cause. See their several demonstrations of Discipline, and the several Defences of them, how little they differed, when *Bancroft* preacht against them at *Pauls Cross*, Feb. 8. 1588. An English man wrote a *Brief Discovery* of his untruths, &c. And a Scotch man *J. D. Bancrofts rashness in railing against the Church of Scotland*, printed 1590. And how little differ they, if at all (and Dr.

Reignolds

Reignolds wrote a Letter against it to Sir *Francis Knowles*, printed with Sir *Francis Knowles* his account to the Lord *Burleigh* of his Speech in Parliament, against the Bishops keeping Courts in their own names, as condemned by Law.

And in many of their writings the English own the Scotch Discipline and Church. And yet even these Scots have rejected *Brown* as a Schismatick, and the English Confuter of *Bancrofts* Sermon tells him, *Pag.* 43, 44. *Brown a known Schismatick is a Fit man to be one of your Witnesses against the Eldership : His entertainment in Scotland was such as a proud ungodly man deserved to have : God give him and you repentance.* And *Giffords*, *Pagets*, *Bradshaws*, *Brightmans*, *Ratbbands*, *Balls*, &c. words against the Brownists proved not them to be against their own doctrine and practice, no more than the Scots rejecting *Brown* proved them against theirs.

§ 13. And another proof is the common doctrine of the Nonconformists, of the difference of the Magistrates, and the Churches Offices. The said confutation of *Bancroft* hath it, *pag.* 45 and forward, and abundance of their publick writings; *viz.* That the Magistrate only hath the power of the Sword, and of Civil Government, and to restrain and punish Ministers that offend by Heresie or otherwise : But that as Preaching, Sacraments and the disciplinary use of the Keys are proper to the Ministry, so the deciding of Circumstantial controverties about them and about the due ordering of them, doth primarily belong to Ecclesiastical Synods. Therefore if these Synods were for their Preaching, they were not for ceasing it meerly in obedience to the Magistrate that silenced them.

§ 14. And it is proved by the many Volumes which they wrote against the Power of our Diocesans, that it was not any Ecclesiastical Authority of theirs (which they thought it a sin to disobey.)

§ 15. And Mr. *Fox*, a Nonconformist and many more of them, own the Doctrine of *Wicliff* and *John Huffle*, and the *Bohemians*, for which the Synods of *Constance* and *Basil*, condemned them, who affirm that it is a heynous sin to give over Preaching, because men excommunicate us, and that such are excommunicated by Christ.

§ 16. And it is not nothing that the most Learned Conformists agree with them, as I have oft cited Bishop *Bilsons* words, that the Magistrate doth not give us our power, nor may hinder our use of it, but is appointed by God to protect and encourage us, and if he forbid or hinder us, we are to go on with our work and patiently suffer.

And even now I believe most of the Leading Clergy think that if a Synod bid us preach and hold assemblies, and the King forbid it, we are

to obey the Synod rather than the King. Mr. *Thorndike*, and many others that write for the Church thought so. And Mr. *Dodwel* thinks so even of a particular Bishop. The difference then is but this: One party giveth this power to a Synod of Bishops (and Presbyters perhaps conjoynd) and the other to a Synod of Parochial Pastors, Doctors and Elders. But both agreed that the Magistrates prohibition in that case is not to be obeyed. And the Conformists will not take it well if I should say that the Nonconformist are more for obedience to Magistrates than they: I still except the *Eraſtians*, and such as own Dr. *Stillingfleets* Irenicon.

§ 17. There is a most considerable book called *A Petition directed to her most Excellent Majesty shewing a meane how to compound the Civil Dissensions in the Church of England*, where the Author (I suppose some Lawyer) *Pag.* 23. tells us what was the difference between the Papists and them that desired Reformation (Nonconformists) about the power of Magistrates. *And.* 1. *They give the Prince Authority over all Persons Ecclesiastical whatsoever; The Papists exempt the Clergy:* 2. *They hold that a Prince may depose a Priest, as Solomon did Abiather, and accordingly they obey being silenced: The Papists deny it.* 3: *They affirm, if the Priests make wicked decrees, the Prince may enforce them to better. The Papists deny it.* 4. *They say Princes must and ought to make Laws for the Church, but with the advise of Godly Pastors: The Papists deny it.* 5. *They hold that if the Pastors be unlearned and ungodly, the Prince may of himself without their advise, make Orders and Laws, for Ecclesiastical matters: The Papists deny it.* 6. *They will subscribe in this point to the Articles of Religion established by Law; to the Apology of the Church of England, to the writings of Jewel, Horn, Nowel, Whitaker, Bilson, Fulk. They take the Oath of Supremacy.*

Here the second Article seemeth to be contrary to what I have said. But the book whence he citeth it (*de discipl. Eccles.*) and all their writings shew, that it is but the same that I say, which they assert, *viz.* That Princes ought to restrain or silence intollerable men, and such Usupers or delinquents as give just cause. 2. That if they mistake and do it unjustly, we must leave Temple and Tyths to their will. 3. Yea, and forbear our own publick Preaching when the publick good on the account of order and peace requireth it; but not when the publick good, and the necessity of Souls, and our own opportunities require the contrary. And the silenced that submitted still, went on to exercise their Ministry against Law in that manner as best conduced to its ends.

And what this Aúother saith of the Papists, I suppose many of the highest Prelatists come nearer then the Nonconformists; and were the Prince against them, would obey the Bishops before him.

And

And the same book describing the Nonconformists in twenty Articles p. 55. in the 8th. thus expoundeth it [*They teach that neither the Ministers nor people ought to make any general Reformation, with force and armes, or otherwise of their own authority change any laws made or established for Religion by Authority of Parliament: But they hold that the general Reformation doth belong to the Magistrates as Gods Licutenant: and that for themselves they may and ought in dutiful sort both Preach and Write, and sue to the Magistrates for redress of Enormities, and also practice the ordinances of Christ which he hath commanded his Church to keep to the end of the World.*

And Article 20. *It is not all the unprepared Parish that they would have brought under Discipline: But those of each Parish who are prepared and willing.*

§ 18. In short the demonstration, the supplication, the humble motion to the Council, and almost all the Nonconformists writings shew, that. 1. Their great Cause was to set up Parish Discipline, under Superior Synods. 2. Being themselves almost all in publick Churches, at least *per vices*, and being still in hope of publick reformation, they were greatly against the Brownists violence, that would break those hopes. 3. They held that Christs Law was their Rule, which commanded this Discipline, which no Magistrate could dispense with. 4. But that Magistrates must be obeyed in such ordering of Church matters as belong to them. But not in forbearing such exercise of the Ministry as was needful to its ends, the Churches good. And as its said, they practised accordingly.

I. The Brownists denied the truth of the Parish Ministry and Churches, and the lawfulness of Communion with them. II. The Semiseparatists held it lawful to hear them preach, but not to joyn in the Liturgy and Sacrament. And this is it that *Phil. Nye*. wrote for.

III. The Presbyterians and meer Nonconformists thought it lawful, and meet in those Parishes which had capable Ministers, to joyn in both Liturgy Sermons and Sacraments, where sin was not imposed on them. But so (as though forbidden) while they had publick Churches, to do their best to practice Christs Commands and Discipline, and where they could have none to further the same ends as effectually as they could, in the opportunities left them. But never took it for their duty to leave all their Ministry or publick preaching meerly in obedience to the laws: much less to the Bishops.

When all this is so notorious, and when I knew the minds of many aged Nonconformists about forty years agoe as my familiar friends, who were all of the same mind in this as I am, what history can I be more assured of, than, as I said, that First, They took not praying publicly

publicly and gathering Assemblies to be therefore sinful, because it was forbidden by the Law. 2. But to be a sin against Prudence and the ends of their Ministry, when it was like to do more hurt than good, by exasperating the Prince, and depriving themselves and others of better advantages for those holy ends; 3. And that it was a duty when it was like to do more good than hurt: 4. And therefore they broke Laws where they could be endured, even in Chappells and Parish Churches.

§ 5. And it is not inconsiderable that the reasons why *Calvin*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Beza*, said what they did for submissive forbearing publick Preaching and Church gathering, were First, Because as they saw that the Prince was resolved not to suffer it, so Reformation was then but begun, and the Prince and Magistrates were the principal means of it, and they had great hopes that what could not be done at present to perfect it, might be done afterwards at a fitter time. King *Edward* was fain to quiet the seditious Papists by making them believe that Latin and English, was the great difference between the former Mass worship and the Liturgy: Aftertimes had no such necessity: and tumultuously to disturb the Magistrate in his prudent progress of Reforming, had been to serve the enemies of Reformation.

But in our times, Parliaments (who the Doctor *S.* saith, are intrusted to Consent for us) have these fifty years told the Kingdom that the Reformation was growing backwards, and the increase of Popery by favour and publick tolleration designed, and much accomplished; and Plots threatned the restoring of it: and if Parliaments deceived us, yet the chief Actors themselves were to be believed: Doctor *Heylin* maketh the syncretism and closure with them in the bosom of the now indulgent Church, to be Arch-Bishop *Lauds* very laudable designs. Arch-Bishop *Bromhal*, saith *Grotius*, was to have held some place among us, as a Protestant, and was of the English Bishops mind, and he himself doth say the last; and I have shewed in his own words that *Grotius* took *Rome* for the Mistress of all Churches, and that there was no way for the Union of Protestants, but to joyn in Union with *Rome*, and that he owned the Doctrine of the Councils even of *Trent* it self, requiring but the amending of the Clergies lives, and the casting by the Schoolmens bold disputes, and the restraint of the Popes Government to the Rule of the Canons, securing the rights of Kings and Bishops, and this he saith will content the peaceable: *Vincentius* wrote a book called *Grotius Papizans*; *Saravins* in his Epistle upon speech with *Grotius* laments it as too true: His friend *Dion. Petavius* told Mr. *Ereskin* an honourable person attendant

dant on the King, that *Grotius* resolved to have declared himself for the Church of *Rome*, if he had returned alive from the Journey that he dyed in. See Mr. *Thorndike's* just weights, what he was for.

And how far many Doctors of this Church, some yet living, have maintained that *Grotius* principles are not Popery, and consequently what such mean by Popery when they disclaim it, I need not tell you, while so many of them have published it in print; And are not Mr. *Thorndike's* termes of Concord in Councils till the eight hundredth year much like and much more in book aforesaid?

And surely there is great difference between such Preachings as were like to be the ruin of the begun Reformation by exasperating a Reforming Magistrate, and such Preaching as tendeth to stop the revolt of a reformed Nation, when Parliaments and the Agents themselves of the revolt, proclaim the danger.

Its true that there was then a greater scarcity of Preachers than now: And that was the Nonconformists argument with the Bishops when they pleaded for publick liberty: But its as true that they had far greater hopes of that Liberty, which it had been folly to cast away, for less: But it is not so with us; we are a greater number than they, and have new Laws to shut us out not only of the Churches, but of Corporations, and Bishops that will give us no such liberty.

§ 6. And indeed so many were the unlearned Parish Priests, and so bad, in Queen *Elizabeth's* daies, being many of them lately silly Mass Priests, that the shame of the Church and the cry of the Protestant people forced the Bishops to tolerate most of the Nonconformists in some publick Church, especially those that were moderate and did not publicly oppose them. Dr. *Humphrey* was allowed Reigus Professour in *Oxford*: Dr. *John Reynolds* President of *Corpus Ch. Col.* Mr. *Perkins*, Lecturer in *Cambridge*, Mr. *Paul Bayne* after him, so Dr. *Chaderton* there, &c. some tell men that these were all Conformists, and of the Church; And yet I am none that am of the same mind. The truth is, they were for submitting to kneeling at the Sacrament, Surplice and most of the Liturgy, rather than cease Preaching: But they were against subscription, and the English sort of Diocesan Bishops and Government, and the imposed use of the Cross, as it is in Baptism: As Tradition tells us, and as you may partly see in Dr. *Reynolds* Letter to Sir *Francis Knowles*, in Mr. *Baynes*, Diocesans Tryal, his Letters, and in *Fuller* and other Histories, And Mr. *Deering*, Mr. *Greenham*, Mr. *John Fox*, Mr. *Marbury*, *Dudley*, *Fenner*, Mr. *Knewstubs*, yea I think six or ten to one, were en-

dured

dured in publick Churches long, before they were hindered; And when they were hindered, they spake peaceably and intreatingly, and were still in hope of publick Liberty, and were oft petitioning or making great Friends to the Bishops to that end much they long obtained and more they hoped for. How long Mr. *Travers* was kept in at the Temple, is commonly known.

§ 7. It is neither consistent with my leisure, nor the business now in hand, nor I suppose the patience of most readers, that I should prove this further by a Voluminous transcribing Histories already extant. If the Book which Dr. *St.* citeth called *part of a Register* be perused, he will find, 1. That the passage cited by the D. was the reprehension of many Londoners taken at a meeting in an open Hall of a Company, which meeting they avowed: Is this a proof that they were against such publick meetings, or for it? When for it they lay in many Prisons:

2. That they professed that they forsook not the Publick Churches, till their Teachers were silenced and turned out: So little doth silencing tend to union.

3. That yet these being ordinary Citizens, spake many things weakly, crying out too rashly of the Rags and Ceremonies of Antichrist: But he might have found many things in the Register more worthy his communication: For instance.

1. The Letter of Dr. *Wy*: In the beginning. 2. Dr. *Pilkington* (after Bishop of *Durham*) his Letter of weighty reasons against silencing the Nonconformists. 3. Mr. *Edward Deerings* answer to the Articles put to him, twice: with sober and Peaceable words. 4. Mr. *Greenbams* modest and peaceable Apology to the Bishop of *Eli*, against Conformity, yet refusing to give his Reasons, lest they should provoke till he were constrained (as I did seventeen years). All which shew that the Nonconformists then were mostly in possession of some publick Churches, or but newly turned out, and in hope of restauration. And what is all this to our case of total and peremptory exclusion?

§ 8. And methinks the Doctor should not desire to tempt the Reader that tryeth his citations to read the rest of that Register: viz. 1. The harsh usage of Mr. *Johnson*, who dyed in prison, driven into too sharp Language by their usage. 2. The exceptions of Mr. *Crane*. 3. The Ministers complaint to the Councils; 4. Especially the Councils Letter to the Justices on the behalf of the Ministers, worthy to be perused at this time. 5. A notable Treatise called a Letter to a Londoner, against the Legality of the Bishops proceedings. 6. The Comons complaint for a Learned Ministry, shewing what a shameful sort of men were kept in by the bishops, while

while the Nonconformists were turned out and silenced. 7. The practises of the Prelates. 8. The Petition to the Queen and that to the Convocation. 9. Mr. *Marburys* conference with the Bishop of *London*, and his Arch-Deacon. How the Bishop railed and swore at him, and reviled him for desiring that all Parishes should have Preachers, as if Homily Readers were not enough. And yet Mr. *Marbury* was so moderate that at last with liberty of interpretation (like *Chillingworths*) he conformed. 10. Mr. *Dudley Fenners* defence of the Ministers against Dr. *Bridges* slanders: Written but a month before his death, whereas the said *Fenner* was far from unlearned (as his *Methodical Theologia* shews) and was so moderate that Dr. *Ames* saith he much conformed at last; but it seems not enough: and he sheweth how the Bishops set themselves against such Preachers. 11. Mr. *Garvtons* troubles. 12. *Dudley Fenners* Counter-poyson, or certain form of Eccles. Government and its defence. 13. The demonstration of discipline. Doth the Dr. believe indeed that these writings signifie that the Nonconformists of those times thought it a sin to Preach *eo nomine* because forbidden?

§ 9. They wrote indeed a great deal more against separation than he citeth, and more than all the Conformists did. And yet they were not more against it than Bishop *Bilson*, who saith, *If the Magistrate forbid us our work we must go on, and patiently suffer.* Mr. *Hildersham* was called *Malleus Schismaticorum*, and yet he and I are Schismatics with these men: Mr. *John Pagets* Arrow against separation, Mr. *Bradshaw*, Mr. *Gifford*, Mr. *Ball*, &c. have said enough. But he that knoweth their controversie knoweth that it was none of the question, whether it be lawful to Preach when the Magistrate forbids it, or whether our Parish Churches and Diocesan be to be preferred before more Reformed Churches when they may be had? But whether. 1. The Parish Churches be no true Churches? 2. Or such as it is unlawful to communicate with occasionally? 3. Or constantly when no better can be had without greater hurt than benefit? 4. Whether it be a duty to gather Churches or Preach publicly when it is like to do more hurt than good, by the Magistrates opposition? 5. Whether we should not quietly bear with that in a Church which we cannot reforme, while no sin is put on us, and the Communion of it is no worse than that of our Parish Churches? In all these they were against the separatists; and so am I. 6. Yea they pleaded the duty of obeying the Magistrate by forbearing to Preach when their Preaching was not necessary: And so do I.

§ 10. One would think they that take Homilies for Sermons, should confess that the Nonconformists writing against the prohibition of the

Law, was a Preaching, or much more: as it is more publick. And did the Nonconformists *write when forbidden*, so much as *Cartwright, Parker, Sandford, Fenner, Gilby, Ames*, and abundance more have done; yea and writ against Diocefanes and Conformity as these and *Braashaw, Nichols, Brightman, Bayne, Travers*, and abundance more have, even many hundreds, as the Millinary Petition and the Country Complaints &c. shew; and yet did these men every one of them take it for sin to Preach, because it was disobedience? But nothing will convince some men.

§ 11. But I appeal to the reason and humanity of mankind, into what hands the silenced and persecuted Ministers are fallen? Is it humane first to charge them with resisting the Laws, by Preaching, gathering Churches, and administering Sacraments, and making Canons and setting up new Discipline, and to publish this to the land and world by such Authority as Arch Bishop *Bancrofts*, Doctor *Heylins* &c. till it is become their Common Charge to render them suspected and odious, and till this be taken for undoubted truth: And yet when it may serve for the silencing of us; to maintain it with *Dr. St.* as that which he is *certain* of, that *the old Nonconformists* were against such Preaching and assembling. At this rate we have been hitherto accused and confuted.

Yea upon the foresaid Accusations their Canons were formed against the Nonconformists, forbidding their Assembling, Preaching, calling themselves a distinct Church, and a great deal more such: and yet now the men that conform to these Canons are certain that they were made upon safe suppositions, and not one of the Nonconformists were so guilty.

But doth not the Doctor thus grievously accuse the Church which he would defend? Were they such men 1. that would so falsely accuse the Innocent 2. and use them so cruelly on such false accusations, many of them dying in Prisons, and many lay there long &c. 3. and to form Canons on such false suppositions?

§ 12. And I do not think I shall prevail with him to tell me, whether he that thinks their Case and ours was so much the same, doth verily believe 1. That if they had been in the Plague at *London*, and seen the forsaken people crowding for instruction to prepare for death, the Nonconformists (such as *Bradshaw, Gifford, Hildersham, Greenham, &c.*) would have refused to Preach to them.

2. And if the next year they had seen the Churches burnt, and the City in ruins, and few Parish Ministers officiate, they would have thought it a sin to Preach to the desolate City, to assemble them to worship God;

God; and would have let them under so dreadful judgements, live and dye like prophane Atheists?

3. And if shortly after the King had Licensed them to assemble and Preach, would they have refused it as a sin?

4. And if the Prelates had prevailed by such a Parliament against the Kings License, and he still had shewed the clemencie of his mind by his conivence, and Magistrates were loth to execute the rigorous Laws, and people would not inform, and the informers repented, and thousands more called to the Nonconformists for help, than did there when Popery stuck still in the peoples hearts; would they have thought all this no alteration of the Case, to judge whether their Preaching would do good or hurt?

§ 13. He tells us of the fewness of Nonconformists in King *Edward's* days. And it is a wonder that so many in so short a time, went so far in the Reformation as they did. But so fast were they then in progress, that even the Reformation of Church Laws then by the Commissioners agreed on was in many things so much better than our Canons, as could we now but obtain the same, would go far to heal us. Let me instance in some, and anticipate by it my answer to his after discourse against Parish Discipline.

1. *Cap. 18. de Heres.* They determine of the Salvation of the unbaptized Infants of believers, the contempt only being damning.

2. They define the Church visible (*Cap. 22.*) to be the Congregation of all believers in which the Sacred Scripture is sincerely taught, and the Sacraments (at least in the necessary parts) administred according to Christs institution] But your Canons deny all such here to be true Churches, save theirs, as settled by Law.

3. *De Sacram. Cap. 5.* None to be admitted to the Sacrament till in the Church he have professed his faith. And *de Div. Off. Cap. 7* They that will receive the Communion must the day before come to the Minister that he may have time to excuse their Consciences, and deal with them if they have done any thing ungodly or superstitiously, in which the Church is offended; and also may try their faith, that so he may either correct their ignorance, or terrifie their Contumely, or confirm their doubting. For none ought to be admitted to the Holy table of the Lord, that hath not a perfect belief.] The words need a gentle exposition: but we have no power now to try mens knowledge or belief thus.

4. *Cap. 10.* After evening prayers, the Parish Minister Deacon and Elders with the people, shall call those that have been publicly perverse, and scandalous to confess their sins, and to be publicly corrected, that the

Church may be conformed by their wholesome correction. And the Minister and Deacon with some Elders shall consult how the rest that are of vicious lives, may first by brotherly love according to Christs prescript in the Gospel, be dealt with by sober men; whose admonitions if they receive, they shall give God thanks: But if they go on in the Crime, they shall be sharply punished as the Gospel prescribeth.]

5. De Concion. Cap. 3. Preachers shall name no guilty person before the multitude, unless such as have contemned Ecclesiastical Admonitions]such may be named.

6. De Exc. Excommunication for none but horrible Crimes, &c. Cap. 4. and after oft admonition. But you Excommunicate all Godly men that do but say your Conformity is not lawful, *ipso facto* by your Canon.

7. Cap. 6. [We permit not the power of Excommunication to be in any one person: Though the consent of the whole Church be specially desirable, yet because it is hard to gather and take it, let Excommunication thus proceed, that the Arch-Bishop, Bishop, or other lawful Ecclesiastical Judge, call one Justice of peace, and the Minister of the place where the guilty person dwelleth, or his deputy, and two or three other Learned and well manerred Presbyters, in whose presence, when the matter hath been most diligently handled and gravely weighed, the sentence of Excommunication shall pass. Cap. 7. And be written.

Cap. 16 There is written a large pious form like a Sermon to be used at the Reconciling of the penitent, and his form of confession, and petition to be received, and then the Pastor of that Church is to ask all the flock, whether they will forgive the offender and pray for him, and whether they will have him received into their Congregation as a brother. And then the Pastor is to exhort the penitent, and then absolve him (A great and solemn work, most unlike your Discipline). And then to give God thanks and pray for him and the Church.

Should we now but move for thus much in order to concord with the Conformists, we have reason to think no importunity could prevail for it; were the consequents of our division as dismal as they are now by most proclaimed. Yet verily we are most unexcuseable wretches, if we have learned no more to this day than they did in so few years; or under full power and opportunity will resist that good, which they that wanted such opportunity wished for; and go back as fast as they went forward.

Seet. 14. To p. 8. [I never said that the troubles at *Frankford* were so much about *free* or *formal Prayer*, as that the *Presbyterians* refused all forms.]

Seet. 15. p. 19. He confesseth that [*Whittingham, Sampson, Gilby* and others, accepted of preferment and employment in the Church, the Bishop shewing them kindness for their forward zealous Preaching;] and this being without their subscribing to conform, is it any wonder then that they gathered not Assemblies elsewhere? Had the Bishops so tryed us, we should never have put them to talk so of our separation, (but might have done our best to build more Churches.) Doth none of all this difference their case and ours?

Seet. 16. p. 20. He confesseth when [*they were silenced, they began to have separate Meetings,*] and yet were all the old Non-Conformists against such.

Seet. 17. As to *Beza's Letter*, have not I said more against Separation than he doth? Doth the Dr. think the Reader so blind as not to see that *Beza's* words are just of the same importance with the account I gave, and contrary to his, viz. [*He trembleth at the thoughts of their exercising their function against the will of the Queen and Bishops, for such reasons as may be easily understood, though we say never a word of them:*] Its easie indeed to see what he trembles at, and why he named them not, which he would sure in charity have done, had it been because it is sinful disobedience to preach when forbidden: It was easie to see what hurt it would have done in the ruine of Preachers and hearers, and shaking all the begun Reformation: Its not so with us, *Gualter* and *Zanchy* say not so much against Separation as I do, nor *John Fox*, nor *Bullinger* whom he citeth; we say the same.

Seet. 18. The same I say of *Parker* and *Gifford*, and I again tell him that he may name many more; *Hildersham, Paget, Ame, &c.* I am of their judgment in their opposition to the Brownists; but it is a notorious untruth (pag. 33.) that the force of all the Non-Conformists reasonings against Separation, lay in two Suppositions. 1. That nothing could justify Separation from our Church, but such corruptions which overthrew the being and constitution of it, &c. And 1. It must be remembred that Separation being a word of very many senses, they held indeed that [*none ought to separate from a Church accusing it to be none, but for that which proved it to be none.*] 2. But did they deny that which all the Christian World confesseth? viz. 1. What if our English Divines gathered by Bishop *Hall* against *Burton*, be in the right, that the Church of *Rome* is a true Church, as a Thief is a true man, (though I think otherwise) must not such Bishops or Conformists therefore separate from them?

2. What if a Church impose some Lye, false Oath, or Subscription, or some actual Sin in Worship, as a condition *sine qua non* of her Communion; is it not lawful to separate into better Assemblies?

3. What if they put down all preaching save reading some dry Homilies, and all Discipline, is it not lawful elsewhere to serve God better? But of this more after where he repeateth it. The Brownists case was quite other before described.

Sett. 19. to p. 36, 37. We also hold that whosoever separateth from the Church of *England*, 1. As having not that Preaching and Sacraments which are of necessity to Salvation. 2. Or as not professing true saving Faith, doth by consequence separate from all Churches in the world; because they have all the same Word, Sacraments, and Christian Faith. And to this Mr. *Jacobs* Argument is good, p. 38: (though he was the man that answered *Downam's* Sermon for Bishops, and esteemed one of the first Independents :) And Mr. *Balls* words to the same purpose, and the second Supposition p. 39. we grant, and think verily that the late Conformists have said more against the truth of the Church of *England*, than we; yea, that we are the defenders of it against the Brownists and them, *Ball, Bradshaw, Gifford, Hildersham, &c.* cited by him, defend it as we do, and better than such as Dr. *Heylin, Thorndike, Mr. Dodwel*, and such others. Did he think any of this concerned me?

Sett. 20. Yes, for p. 74. he saith, [*We would blind the Reader by finding out the disparity of some Circumstances; but not one of us can deny that it was their judgment, that the holding separate Congregations for worship, where there was an agreement in Doctrine and the substantials of Religion, was unlawful and schismatical.*]

Ans. Its pity so seeing a Dr. should tempt men to be so blind, 1. As to think all the differences which I have named, inconsiderable. 2. And to go on to abuse themselves and others, with the ambiguous word [*Separate*] no better explained. 3. And to think the other causes before and after named of some sort of Separation, to be insufficient; and I am sorry for the Dr. if this be his own Profession, that he would tell any lie, or commit any other sin, or forsake any other part of Religion, rather than separate to other Assemblies, from a Church that agreed in Doctrine and the substantials of Worship with him. The Presbyterians then are sure of him, if they were but in possession; and it seems in *Moscow* he would forsake preaching. But what if the King licensed a preaching Church, would he refuse the use of it for fear of separating from a mere reading Church.

This Protean word [*separate*] serveth for many uses: I will put one case more to the Dr. (not feigned.) A Conformist Gentleman was of
the

the opinion that his Parish Church was no true Church, because the Vicar was a Socinian, and another because the Parson was ignorant of the essentials of Christianity ; and they go to the next Parish Church. A Nonconformist in the same Parish, goeth to a Nonconformists Chappel, but doth not accuse the Parish Church as none, as the other do ; which of these separateth more ? At *Gloucester* one took the Diocesan Church for no true Church, because Bishop *Goodman* was a Papist, and the Bishop is a constitutive part ; and yet this man was for Diocesans : A Nonconformist went to a Nonconformists Church, but would not say the Diocesan Church was none : Which separated more ? He *separateth* from his Parish Church against the Canon, who goeth from an ignorant scandalous Reader, to communicate with a Preacher at the next Parish : He separateth from the Parish Churches, who judgeth them true Churches, but having the Kings License, joyneth constantly with the French, Dutch, or Nonconformists as better, still owning mental communion where he hath not local ; and he separateth from the French, Dutch, or Nonconformist Churches, who thus leaveth them (as true Churches) to joyn with the Church of *England* as better. Many and various are the sorts and degrees of Separation, and not all lawful or all unlawful : None of these are the Brownists separation, which the old Nonconformists confuted ; which consisted in a denial, 1. That the English Ministers were true Ministers. 2. And their Churches true Churches. 3. Or such as a Christian might lawfully live in communion with in ordinary worship. 4. And therefore they were all bound to renounce them, and set up others.

I doubt the Dr. is far more a Separatist than I, and such as I ; for I am for Communion with all Christians, as far as they separate not from Christ ; and I hate the false accusing of any Church as if it were none, or its Communion unlawful. I can be but in one place at once, but in heart I joyn with all Christians on earth except in sin ; and locally I joyn where I see greatest reason for it, preferring that which I judge most agreeable to Gods word, so far as I may without greater hurt. But the Canonical Conformists, unchurch all the Churches here but their own, and utterly refuse Communion with them, even with those that refuse not Communion with them. And some think that forcible silencing, fining, excommunicating, and imprisoning, is not the gentlest sort of separating.

But doth he in all his Book do any thing to satisfie any mans Conscience, that would know from what Churches he may or may not separate ? Not a word that I can find, that decideth such a doubt. His two words here used are [*Agreement in Doctrine, and substantial of Religion,*] whereas 1. Religion is in *Acts* and *Habits*, and hath no proper *substance*, and what

his term [*substance*] meaneth, till he tells us, none can know. It must be either an *essential* part, or an *integral* part, for an *Accident* I suppose it is not. If only an *essential* part, what Christian dare say that I may sin against all the meer integrals of Religion, rather than go from the Church that imposeth such sin upon me. If it be all the integrals that we must agree in, then we differ in no one part of Religion; for *Accidents* are not parts: And then who contradicts him? When men differ in no part of Religion, they will not separate unless merely locally: Are all the things named in my first *Plea*, no parts of Religion? It may be by [*Substance*] he meaneth only the greater sort of *Integrals*, but how shall we know where to fix our measures; what duty is so small that I may omit it, or what sin so small that I may commit it for Communion.

2. And as for *Doctrine*, they that differ in any part of Religion, are supposed to differ in the doctrine about that part. But can any man tell what *Doctrine* it is that he maketh our agreement in to be necessary, or the test of Communion. If I should separate from all Churches from which I differ in any the least doctrine, I know not where the Diocesan or National Church is that I might hold Communion with: Do all the Conformists agree in all doctrines? If it be in all that *the Law imposeth*, how various, mutable, and uncertain is that.

I distinguish between *Doctrine professed by the Church*, and *Doctrine imposed on me to profess it*. As to the first, I will communicate with a Church that hath twenty false Doctrines, consistent with the essentials of Christianity and Church Communion. As to the second, I will not knowingly profess one false *Doctrine* for Communion with any Church on Earth.

Did not the Nonconformists differ from the Conformists, in the Doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture for regulating Church-Order and Worship; and about the Divine Right of *Diocesans* and Elders, and about Parish Discipline. Do not we now differ about the *undoubted certainty of the salvation of all dying baptized Infants*? Will this warrant a separation?

SECT. 21. p. 75. He tells us very confidently that *diversity of circumstantial pretences for Separation*, alter not the case: But 1. Its true that if twenty men have twenty false pretences for Separation, none of them are thereby justified; but if one man have a just cause, it justifieth him: I named very many just and unjust causes in my *Plea*. and he giveth no answer to it. 2. Are they such circumstances before named: Oaths, Declarations, Subscriptions, Doctrine, &c? 3. What if the Law should change, and allow of various Churches? what if the King license them? These be but circumstances: What if the Plague drive away the Parish Ministers? what if the Churches be burnt and the people forsaken? will no such circumstances

stances make other Assemblies lawful, because he calls them *separate*.

Secl. 22. p. 78. His undertaking is repeated: [He is *certain that preaching in opposition to our established Laws, is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Nonconformists of former times.*] *Answ.* If I have not proved the contrary, I cannot prove that they were English men.

But 1. he proveth that they were all of that mind, by citing four of their Books against Brownists; and were four or forty times four, all? But Mr. *Rathbands* is said to be the *Nonconformists*. Doth he believe that he meant that all or the twentieth part of the Nonconformists wrote or subscribed it? One of the Names to it is Mr. *Simeon Ash*, my intimate dear friend, whose judgment in these matters was the same with mine, whom I was with even in his sickness almost to the last hour of his life, and was buried *Aug. 23. 1662.* the day before the Law had else silenced him, and he was to me a better Expofitor of his own mind, than the Dr. can be: He was so much for going on to preach, that his Motto in his Funeral Ring was, [*I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ:*] I yet keep my Ring, and can shew it you.

And as to old Mr. *Langley*, another of them, I heard him my self preach in *Alborton Church in Shropshire*, a Thanksgiving Sermon for the hopes of deliverance from the silencing Bishops, when the Law forbade him: And for old Mr. *Slater*, I heard him preach at *Trinity Church in Coventry* when the Law forbade him: And did they not understand their own Writings better than the Dr. doth?

Secl. 23. And I would I knew how to prevail with him to tell me, whether the Law and Canon did not forbid all the Ministers in *England* to worship God according to the Directory, and neglect the Common Prayer Book, which yet almost all did for many years in the times of usurpation: And yet of nine thousand or more of these, seven thousand since conformed to the Church of *England*, and they say that this Dr. is one of them. If mere disobedience then be the sin, all these lived so long in sin, and he with others.

Secl. 24. But all that can be gathered out of the four Books cited and such others is but this, which is our judgment: 1. That Churches and Pastors are under the Kings Government as well as other Subjects. 2. That it belongeth to him to punish them for evil doing, and encourage them in doing well. 3. That as to this his own execution, he is the publick Judge whether they do well or ill. 4. That if he justly forbid any to preach or assemble he must be obeyed. 5. And if he mistake in particular cases, not destroying the ends of his Government, the common good, he must not be resisted, nor in such a manner disobeyed, as tendeth more to the common hurt

hurt than his mistake doth, nor disabled to Govern by their dishonouring him, much less by Rebellion or Confusion. 6. Nor are men bound to cast away their great advantages for Gods service which they then had, on pretence of *doing better*, when by accident it would do more hurt than good, nor as *Bradshaw* saith, to run on the Sword, or oppose Sword to Sword, or raise Sedition, and ruin themselves in vain.

Their advantages were many : 1. Lawful Communion in the Parish Churches. 2. Most of them either constantly or by fits, had publick Churches or Chappels to preach in, and were still in hope. 3. The Magistrate protected them and the Reformation. 4. They hoped for a progress of it, whereas had they openly done as the Brownists, they had endangered the Reformation by the exasperation, and ruined themselves, and lost most of their labour : So that it is plain that preaching in that imprudent manner which is like to do more harm than good, they took to be a double sin, as *hurtful* and as *disobedience* ; for obedience is due in such a case. But in case the manner and circumstances be such as that these evils are not consequent, but more good than hurt to be expected ; they thought the bare breach of the Law no sin.

Seet. 25. Which I yet further prove, 1. Because its agreed by all, that Governing Order is a *medium* for the thing ordered ; and never obligeth when it overthroweth the end, power being given to Edification and not to Destruction : None have power to forbid the necessary preaching of the Gospel, and probably to damn Souls. 2. Because else the Nonconformists should be more against preaching when forbidden than the Conformists ; who say as Bishop *Bilson*, *We must go on with our work, & suffer* : and as Bishop *Andrews* *Tortur. Torti. Cohibeat Regem Diaconus, &c.* 3. Yea, the Papists who on pretence of Obedience are tyrannical, yet mostly agree (as I have elsewhere proved) that humane Laws bind not beyond the case of scandal, when they are against the common good : And a *Toletane* Council decreed, that their Constitutions should not be taken to bind *ad peccatum*, (to hazard Souls) but only *ad pœnam*. 4. As I have said, their own practice fully expounded their words, who constantly broke the Law and Canon in preaching in Houses and in Chappels without, or contrary to the Liturgy, or a part of it. So did Mr. *Ball* at *Whitemore*, Mr. *Hind* at *Banbury*, Mr. *Geree* and Mr. *Fox* at *Tewksbury*, *John Rogers* at *Dedham*, Mr. *Taylor*, Mr. *Harvy*, Mr. *Bourne* at *Manchester*, Mr. *Gee*, Mr. *Johnson*, Mr. *Hancock*, Mr. *Barlow*, Mr. *Broxholme*, Mr. *Cooper*, and abundance more, besides those mentioned before.

And now I leave it to the Dr.'s further thoughts, whether he spake truly of the sence of *All the Nonconformists*, and have proved what he undertook.

took. To abuse the Magistrate, or do his part for publick Reformation, they were against, and so are we.

Seet. 26. As to his question, *Was there less necessity then or now?* I answer, 1. There was then more necessity as there is of you or me in *America*, where we cannot preach; the people, lately Papists, desired not their helps, nor scrupled hearing others, as many thousands do now. 2. There was necessity then and so there is now, but opportunity must joyn with necessity to oblige, which they had more than we by connivence in Chappels, where was necessity, and they had less than we in other places.

Seet. 27. As to the Answers of Mr. *Sprint*, on my knowledge the usual answer was, That evil must not be done that we may have leave to do good, and that if others hinder me because I will not sin, it is not my omission of any duty; yet the disparity of the Apostles case and ours, may be mentioned to shew the difference of obligations.

Positive Precepts bind not *ad semper*, but *Negatives* do; and its too gross a shift to turn a *Negative* to a *Positive*, and then pretend that the comparison is between two duties: preaching is a duty when we can do it, but not when we cannot do it, unless we will swear, subscribe, profess, or practise a forbidden thing.

Seet. 28. I conjecture that to what I have proved of the practice of the Nonconformists, it will be said that *Their preaching in peculiar places, Chappels, or Churches, though in a manner against Law and Canon, was but a partial joyning with the Church of England, and not a separation; and the connivence of the Bishops was a kind of Toleration.*

Ans. 1. And is not my case the same? We had more than connivence when we had the Kings Licenses, and ever since experience tells you that his Clemency hath occasioned a restraint of the Bishops, and some connivence from them. 2. And if it were the Temples that make the difference, let them allow us to preach there and see whether we will refuse it: And sure the Conformists that preach in Tabernacles are not Separatists; the Parish Teacher of St. *Martins* now preacheth in the same place which I built to have preached in, and for so doing was by a warrant judged to prison. They had no more Law on their side than I have, they usually read no more of the Liturgy but the Confession and the Scriptures, and many not the first at all, and some more; so that its a full proof that if *breaking the Law had been all their stop*, they would have still preached.

Seet. 29. Dr. *Ames* tells us that he had preached without the Bishops consent by this Story, *fresh Suit*, p. 4c9. describing an English Bishops Pastoral work, he saith. "It would be ridiculous for a mean man to desire him
"to visit him, his Wife, or Children, in sickness; he must have a Chaplain
"not

“not only to do other duties of Religion for him, but even to give thanks
 “at his Table. I will not here speak of [*draw up an Excommunication for*
him, take him Pursuivant, Jaylor see to your Prisoner ;] but note one ex-
 “ample of mine own experience, which many others can parallel : I was
 “once (and but once I thank God) before a Bishop, and being presented
 “to him by the chief Magistrates of a Corporation, to be Preacher in their
 “Town ; the lowly man first asked them, how they durst choose a Preach-
 “er without his consent : You (said he) are to receive a Preacher that I
 “appoint you, for I am your Pastor, though he never fed them : And then
 “turning to me, [How durst you, said he, Preach in my Diocess with-
 “out my leave ?] So that without any other reason but meer Lordship,
 “the whole Corporation and I were dismissed to wait his leisure, which I
 “have done now twenty years and more.

Much like the usage of holy *Paul Bayne*, Successor to *Perkins*, who being commanded to preach a Visitation Sermon, and being sickly and in a sweat with preaching, was fain to refresh himself instead of going presently to attend the Bishop ; and when he was sent for, having small Cuffs edged with a little blew thred, saith the Bishop: *How dare you appear before me with those?* and he suspended him : And good Mr. Bayne would never more have to do with a Bishop, but said, *They are an earthly Generation, and savour not the things of God.*

When Dr. *Fulke* (a half Conformist) went out of St. *Johns* Colledge in Cambridge with his Pupils, hiring Chambers for himself and them, in the Town, it was as great a separation from the Colledge (to avoid the Surplice which he after submitted to) as we make from the Church. See *Ames fresh suit*, p. 473. And that it was no conscience of obeying the Bishop, that *Beza* would have the Ministers moved by, from assembling: Judge by these words, [*De notis Eccles. Ego pontificiis—*] “I willingly leave to the
 “Papists the whole degree of Episcopacy, of which I openly say, the
 “Holy Ghost was not the Author, but humane prudence; which if we
 “observe not that God hath cursed, certainly we even yet see nothing;
 “and we nourish a viper in our bosoms, which will again kill the Mother.

Señt. 30. I will conclude with the recital of the Letter sent to the Bishops by Dr. *Humphrey*, *Regius* Professor in Oxford, who yet constrained, used the Surplice after that: Our Dr. may note what sence they had then of these things, premising only the words of *John Fox*, speaking of *Blumfield* a wicked Persecutor, who threatned a godly man, *Simon Harelson*, for not wearing the Surplice: [*Its pity, saith he, such baits of Popery are left to the enemies to take Christians in; God take them away from us, or us from them: for God knoweth they be the cause of much blindness and strife among men.*

Dr. HUMPHREY's Letter to the BISHOPS.

"Y^{Our Lordships Letter}, directed unto us by our Vice-Chancellor, al-
 "though written in general words, yet hath so hearted our Adver-
 "saries, that we are now no more counted Brethren and Friends but Ene-
 "mies; and sith the old Mass attires be so straitly commanded, the Mass
 "it self is shortly looked for. A Sword now is put into the enemies hands
 "of these that under Q^{Mary} have drawn it for Popery, and under pretence
 "of good order, are ready without cause to bewreck their Popish anger
 "upon us, who in this will use extremity, in other laws of more impor-
 "tance, partiality. I would have wished, my Lords, rather privy admonition
 "than open expulsion; yea I had rather have received wounds of my Bro-
 "ther, than kisses of mine Enemy; if we had privily in a convenient day re-
 "signed, then neither should the punisher have been noted of cruelty,
 "neither the offender of temerity, neither should the Papists have accused
 "(in their seditious Book) Protestants of contention. Religion requireth
 "naked Christ to be preached, professed, glorified; that *graviora legis*, by
 "the faithful Ministry of feeding Pastors, should be furthered, and after
 "that orders tending to edification, and not to destruction, advanced; and
 "finally the Spouses friends should by all means be cherished, favoured,
 "and defended, and not by counterfeit and false intruders, condemned
 "and overborn, and defaced. But alas, a man qualified with inward gifts
 "for lack of outward shews is punished, and a man only outwardly confor-
 "mable and inwardly clean unfurnished, is let alone, yea exalted: The
 "painful Preacher for his labour is beaten, the unpreaching Prelate offend-
 "ing in the greater, is shot free; the learned man without his cap is afflict-
 "ed, the capped man without learning is not touched: Is not this direct-
 "ly to break Gods laws? Is not this the Pharises *va*? Is not this to wash
 "the outside of the Cup, and leave the inner part uncleansed? Is not this to
 "prefer Mint and Annis to faith and judgment and mercy? Mans tradition
 "before the ordinance of God? Is not this in the School of Christ, and in
 "the method of the Gospel a plain disorder? hath not this preposterous
 "order a woe? That the Catechism should be read is the word of God,
 "it is the order of the Church, to preach is a necessary point of a Priest, to
 "make quarterly Sermons is law, to see poor men of the poor mens box re-
 "lieved, Vagabonds punished, Parishes communicate, Rood lofts pull'd
 "down, Monuments of Superstition defaced, Service done and heard, is Scri-
 "pture, is Statute; that the Oath to the Q^{Majesty} should be offered and
 "I taken,

"taken, is required as well by ordinance of God as of man. These are plain
 "matters, necessary, Christian, and profitable. To wear a Surplice, a Coap,
 "or a corner'd Cap is (as you take it) an accidental thing, a device only
 "of man, and as we say a doubt or question in divinity. Sith now these sub-
 "stantial points are in all places of this Realm almost neglected, the offen-
 "der either nothing or little rebuked, and sith the transgressors have no
 "colour of conscience, it is sin and shame to proceed against us first, having
 "also reasonable defence of our doings: Charity my Lords, would first have
 "taught us, Equity would first have spared us, brotherliness would have war-
 "ned us, pity would have pardoned us, if we had been found trespassers.
 "God is my witness, who is the beholder of all faith, I think of your Lord-
 "ships honourably, esteeming you as brethren, reverencing you as Lords and
 "Masters of the Congregation: alas why have not you some good opinion
 "of us? why do you trust known Adversaries and mistrust your Brethren?
 "We confess one faith of Jesus, we preach one doctrine, we acknowledg one
 "Ruler upon earth, in all things (saving in this) we are of your judgment,
 "shall we be used thus for a Surplice? shall brethren persecute brethren
 "for a forked Cap, devised singularity of him that is our enemy? Now shall
 "we fight for the Popes coat, his head and body being banished? shall the
 "controversie so fall out in conclusion, that for lack of necessary furniture
 "(as it is esteemed) labourers shall lack wages? Churches preaching? shall
 "we not teach? shall we not exercise our Talents as God hath commanded
 "us, because we will not wear that which our enemies have desired, and that
 "by the appointment of Friends. Oh that ever I saw this day that our Adver-
 "saries should laugh to see brethren fall together by the ears: Oh that *Ephra-*
 "*im* should thus eat up *Manasses*, *Manasses* *Ephraim*. My Lords, before this
 "take place, consider the cause of the Church, the Crests and triumphs of An-
 "tichrist, the laughter of *Satan*, the sorrow and sighs of a number, the misery
 "and sequel of the Tragedy. I write with zeal without proof of my matter
 "at this time present, but not without knowledg of it, nor without grief of
 "mind: God move your Spirit at this present to fight against *Carnem*, *Cir-*
 "*cumcisionem*, immo *Concisionem*, against *Literam* & *Legem*, which principally
 "is now regarded and rewarded. Speak I humbly beseech you to the Queens
 "Majesty, to the Chancellor, and to Mr. Secretary and the rest, that those
 "proceedings may sleep, that *England* may understand your zealous mind
 "toward the worship of God, your love toward the poor welwillers, your
 "hate toward the professed enemies, your unity in true conformity, the o-
 "ther neither be needful now, neither exacted in any good age: So shall the
 "little Flock be bound to you, so shall the great Shepherd be good to you.

An ANSWER to the false ACCUSATIONS and REASONINGS of the Dr.'s SECOND PART.

Here the Dr. begins with the description of their principles whom he accuseth (I am one of them:) And the first sort are those ["that hold partial and occasional Communion with our Churches to be lawful, but not total and constant,] viz. "[at some times to be present, and in some part of our worship, and on "particular occasion to partake of some acts of Communion with us; but "they apprehend greater purity and edification in separate Congregati- "ons, and when they are to choose they think themselves bound to choose "these, though at certain seasons they may think it lawful to submit to "occasional Communion with our Church.] The second sort are "Such "as hold any Communion with our Church unlawful: And he pretends to "proceed with all possible clearness.]

Ans. I am sorry if more clearness and truth is become *impossible* to him. He taketh not me to be one of the second sort, and therefore describeth me as of the first: Its no presumption to say that I know my own mind and practice better than he doth, though he would seem to know the old Non-conformists minds better than they did themselves.

Sett. 2. The matter of fact must first be notified: 1. I ever distinguish'd the National, Diocesan, Parochial, and Segregate Churches: And the *National* as supposed organized, or an Ecclesiastically political Society, from the *National* as a Christian Kingdom, and as an *agreeing Association of Churches*, without any Governor of the whole (*Single or Aristocratical.*) And I distinguish'd Diocesans that are as Arch-Bishops over lower Bishops; and those that are like ours, *infima speciei*: and I distinguish'd *Parish Churches* that have *true Pastors*, from those that have none but incapable men, through insufficiency, heresie, malignity, or as usurpers are not truly called.

2. Accordingly I concluded, 1. That the Parish Churches in *England* that have true Pastors, are true political governed Churches. 2. That though some would make them none, by denying to the Pastors an essen-

tial part of their office, and make the Bishop the sole Pastor, and the rest but his Curates, and the Parishes no Churches as having no Bishop, but to be only as Chappels, part of the lowest governed Church (Diocesan) and so give up the cause to the Brownists called Separatists; yet truly such Parishes are true political Churches, because the ordainer being but the *investing Minister*, the office is not essentiated as he *willeth* or *saith*, but as God the Instituter *willeth and saith*. As the power of the *Husband* over the *Wife* is not what please the Priest that marryeth them, but what pleaseth God who giveth it by his Law; and as the Lord Mayor's power is not what please the Recorder, or he that giveth him his Oath or *Insignia*, but what the Kings *Charter* giveth; and the Kings power is not what he will that Crowneth him and giveth him his Oath, but what he hath right to by the constitution of the Kingdom; so that the truth of the Parish Churches is soundly maintained by the Nonconformists, and overthrown by many of the Diocesans: But if the Parish Minister himself consent not to the essentials of his own office, his Ministry may be valid to others while he is in the place, but he is, himself, no true Pastor.

3. All Parishes are no true governed Churches, whose Ministers want any thing essential to a Pastor, nor must be owned as such if known.

4. But for the peoples sake they are true Churches, *secundum quid*, or equivocally as a company of Christians may be so called that have no Pastor, and as such may be so far communicated with.

5. I never spake against a Diocesan or Arch-Bishop, that hath Parish Churches, and true Pastors or Bishops under him, and taketh on him no more than the Apostles, did, excepting their work, properly Apostolical, *viz.* by the Word and not the Sword, to oversee and instruct inferior Pastors.

6. When the Diocesans put down all lower Churches and true Pastors, I own not that doing, nor them in that form; but I separate from them no further than they do from Christ.

7. When they are but as good Arch-Bishops taking care of many Churches, whether their Diocess shall be called a *Church* as such, is but *in de nomine*. I find not that any Apostle as such, was the constitutive Head of a Diocesan or Provincial Church, or made any such, above particular Churches: Nor do I find in the New Testament any political Church form, but the Universal headed by Christ, and particular ones governed by Pastors. The General is the constitutive Head of his Army, and the Colonel of his Regiment, and the Captain of his Troop, as distinct subordinate Bodies; but the Major General, General of the Ordnance, Quartermaster General, &c. may be only under-Officers to the whole, and the noblest integral

tegral parts, but as such no constitutive Head of any Body of Men whatever: So that General Pastors prove no superior proper Church. But because it was lawful in prudence for the Apostles to have taken several Provinces, limited severally to each, so may men now; and if any call such Churches, I strive not, so the matter be agreed on.

8. I ever owned a *Christian Kingdom*, and the agreeing Association of as many Churches as can for mutual help and concord, and the King to be their Governor by the Sword: And if any will call a Kingdom a Church, or an Association that hath no constitutive Government, a Church; as if he called a Diet or Assembly of many Kings or Princes, a Kingdom or Republick, let him enjoy his Equivocation, so we understand each other.

9. According to these Principles I own my self a Member of the universal Church, of the Church of *England*, and of the Parish or particular Church where for the time I am called to be; that is, as they are. But I think I may remove from Parish to Parish as I have cause, as a dweller or a lodger may; and I take not all the Parish to be the Church, and take Parish bounds to be no Divine Institution, but a humane mutable point of order, convenient when by accident it crosseth not the end, nor doth more harm than good.

10. I think if any Nobleman in *London* confine his ordinary communion to a just assembly in his *Chappel*, or any that have a Minister utterly unsuitable to their needs, do usually hold communion in the next Parish Church for better, he is thereby neither Separatist nor Sinner.

11. According to all this, when I was silenced I ordinarily heard Dr. *Wilkins* and Dr. *Tillotson*; and communicated in several places as I had best opportunity; and quickly going to *Acton*, I there constantly morning and evening joyned at Common prayer and Sermon, communicating in the Sacrament where I had best opportunity, (being loth for the Parson and Curates sake, to tell you why it was not there,) once with Dr. *Horton* and often with Nonconformists. The Plague driving me to *Hambden*, I constantly there joyned in all the publick Worship and Sacrament: Returning to *Acton*, I did as before, and sometime repeated Dean *Rieve's* Sermon, till he got me sent to Gaol for teaching some willing ignorant people between the Church meetings in my house: Thence going to *Totteridge*, I many years constantly twice a day joyned in the publick worship, and took the Sacrament when administred as Mr. *Parre* will testifie. Thence removing to *London*, and licensed by the King to preach, I forbore some time, and after chose only the Market house at St. *James's*, openly declaring that we met not as separating from the publick Churches, but for the need of multitudes that went to no Church for want of room. Since then I have many years joyned in all the publick worship, Word, Prayer, and Sacraments,
with

with the Parish Church, when able, since that I also sometime joyn with Nonconformists, and preach my self Afternoons, and on Thursdays in the Nonconformists Chappels, being not allowed to do it otherwise. In the Country in Summer, I have far off got into some Parish Churches for a day, and tryed neer *London*, but could not have consent, though I have Bishop *Sheldon's* License for that Diocess, I think not yet invalidated. This is the matter of fact.

Now Reader, *Qu.* 1. Doth the tenth part of those counted of this Parish Church, hear and communicate so oft as I do.

Q. 2. If not, what makes them and not me to be of that Church?

Q. 3. What is the constancy that this Dr. maketh necessary to a member?

Q. 4. What are the parts of their worship which he saith I joyn not in? Hath he named any?

Q. 5. Is this only occasional joyning?

Sect. 3. I do maintain that 1. When, *consideratis considerandis*, we may choose the *purest Churches and most edifying Ministry*, it is a duty so to do. And one of his answers (*the Rector, &c.*) hath in the Epistle cited his own words, not out of the retracted *Irenicon*, but his late Book against Popery, expressly threatening us with *damnation* if we do not. To which I find no excuse made by him, yea the Papist adversary grants the same.

2. I do maintain against those that separate from all Churches which they dare not be stated members of, that its lawful to communicate occasionally, where we may not do it statedly: But is this to deny all save occasional communion with all their Churches?

3. I often say that there is so great difference of Parish Ministers, and of Persons cases and opportunities, and Relations, (as Wives, Children, Servants, under Parents, &c. of divers commands, &c.) that to be constant Communicants in their Parish Church, is to some a duty, to some a sin, and so is occasional communion.

Sect. 4. As to the second sort, *that hold all communion with them unlawful.*

1. I leave them to plead their own cause, and I meddle only with my own part. 2. But I must say that if they mistake, those that wilfully give them the occasion are unfit reprovers of them: And if men for worldly ends or by error, will corrupt and defile a Church to the utmost that is consistent with lawful Communion (or neer it) they may make the question *whether their Communion be lawful*, too hard for understandings. Every one cannot tell whether one in a swoon be alive or dead, and some may bury him too hastily.

Stretch not my similitude beyond my meaning. If a Gentleman of the game should by wilful sin, get the *Lues Venerea*, and the case be disputed whether his wife may separate from him, or if he beat her once a week; if

she will not daily eat that which makes her grievous sick, and he doth it to exercise his Authority, another may better plead against her departure than he: If it be a fault in her so to save her self, what is it in him to destroy or abuse her?

If we be forbidden to take poyson, and one will causelessly command us to take a doubtful thing, as Nightshade, Hemlock, *Auripigmentum*, &c. and then condemn us as disobedient for refusing, he is the unfittest person to condemn us. If it be lawful to avoid a house that hath the Plague, a man is excusable that mistakes the spotted Fever for it.

Were your Congregations but full of persons that had the scabs of the small Pox not dried away, and one went to a sounder Congregation for fear of infection, not at all condemning you, he might be born with. If in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, when abundance of Papist Priests staid in the Churches for their Benefices, a man had quietly gone from them to the Nonconformists, I could not blame him; though he had not been sure that they were not changed.

And I still say that if such erre by too much care to avoid sin and save their souls, 1. It is a far greater error to give them the occasion. 2. And in such as you to say, that therefore they must be so far forsaken, as that none may preach to them. If I may preach to no erring people, 1. I must preach to none. 2. Or be no Physician to any that are sick.

And I must say, that though I found no call to gather any together as a Church, and give them the Sacrament; I cannot say that no other had such, unless I had heard them all speak for themselves: yea I see such notorious need in many places, that I dare not blame them.

Self. 5. And now Reader, *Qu.* whether the Dr. hath truly stated the case between him and me; and whether you can expect truth and edification in his handling of a false-stated case.

These are the questions which, as my accuser, (in his Book) he should have handled, had truth been his design. 1. "Whether for one that holdeth so much Communion with their Churches as I have done, and here describe, it be sinful separation to Preach in and Communicate with the Assemblies of Nonconformists, or mixt ones, as I have done?" 2. Whether to deny this to be sinful Separation (*or Separation as commonly taken for Schism*) be disingenious, and worse than theirs that openly renounce their Communion.

Self. 6. Three things he saith, p. 94. we cannot deny, 1. *That there is no reason of Separation because of the Doctrine of their Church.*

Ans. 1. We distinguish of Separation: There is no reason to separate from you as no Church, or further than we do; there is reason to deny

deny our consent, 1. To your foresaid Doctrine of all baptized dying Infants undoubted salvation, not excepting those of Atheists and Infidels. 2. To your included Doctrine implied in your Impositions, viz. "That if a man have unlawfully made a Vow and Oath to endeavour in his Place and Calling to reform some corruptions in Church-Government, yea or to repent of his sin and oppose Popery, Prophaneness, and Schism; there is no obligation on him from that Oath and Vow to do it. These and such other Doctrines we separate from, so far as to reject them.

Sett. 7. His second supposed Concession is, [*That there is no other reason of Separation because of the terms of our Communion, than what was from the beginning of the Reformation.*]

Ans. 1. There are in my judgment no common reasons for going further from you than we do, nor to justify that which is commonly known by the name of Separation. But there are many and great reasons to justify our measure of dissent and ministration; and to say that [*we grant there are no more reasons now than were then,*] is too bold an untruth. There is more reason, 1. From the quality of the things imposed. 2. From the designs and drift of the Imposition. 3. From the effects. 4. From the aggravation of Conformity as in the Church that we must communicate with. 5. From the things which give us a fuller cause for our Preaching and Assemblies. viz. 1. The late general contrary Church State and Engagement to it. 2. The Plague. 3. The burning of the Churches. 4. The Kings License and Clemency. 5. The number and quality of them that seek our helps. Of these briefly in order.

1. As to the things imposed now which were not then.

1. The Vestry Act was not then made, by which so considerable a part of your Parish Churches as the Vestries, are to renounce all obligations to endeavour any alteration of the Government of the Church, from the Oath and Vow called the Covenant: So that all Reformation of Church Government as so sworn, was thus renounced by them who in a sort represent the Parish Church.

2. The Act of Uniformity had not then imposed the same declarative Renunciation of all such obligation on all the Ministers and Schoolmasters in England, as it now doth.

3. The Corporation Act was not then in being, which constituteth all the Officers in power in all Cities and Corporations, of such only as declare, [*that there is no obligation from the said Oath at all,*] not excepting so much as the sworn duties of opposing Popery, Prophaneness, and Schism, to repent of sin and amend our lives. And if swearing and vowing against Schism, no whit bind men (if the Oath were but unlawfully imposed,

fed, why should the Dr. make so great a matter of it, and think that his reasonings should make men afraid of Gods service, if he will but call it Schism.

4. None of these Acts then required men to profess and subscribe, that there is from that Vow or Oath no such Obligation on *any* other person; and so to become Vouchers for the Souls and Consciences of many hundred thousands whom we never saw; even those Parliament men that were not forced to it, but imposed it on others, when we know not in what sense they took it.

5. The Re-ordination of Ministers ordained by Presbyteries was not then required, and made a necessary condition of their Ministration and Church Relation, (even by them that confess Re-ordination unlawful, and therefore plainly intimate the nullity of the first.)

6. The Act of Uniformity was not then made, which requireth all Ministers publickly to declare their *Assent and Consent to all things contained in, and prescribed by the Liturgy, Book of Ordination*, (though part of this was in a Canon.)

7. The false Rule for finding *Easter-day* was not then to be assented and consented to, as a condition of the Ministry.

8. Nor the new Doctrine or Article of Faith, [*of the undoubted certainty by Gods word, that baptized dying Infants are saved,*] (without any exception of the children of Atheists, &c.) For the old words at Confirmation (as many Drs. of the Church have shewed) only meant that nothing else was necessary on the Churches part, that is, not Confirmation.

9. The word [*Pastor*] as applyed to Parish Ministers distinct from Curates, was not then blotted out of most places in the Liturgy; nor the twentieth of *Acts*, as applied to Presbyters, left out, (*Take heed to your selves and the Flock, &c.*) in plain design to alter the Office and Parish Churches.

10. The *Oxford* Oath was not then imposed, to banish Ministers above five miles from all Cities, and Corporations, and Places, where they had of late years preached; so that their old Flock or Friends (yea, Wives and Children that could not follow them) might not so much as see or hear such Ministers in their Families, or familiar converse that would have come to the publick Churches: And all Nonconformist Ministers that took not the Oath, were thereby forbidden to come to the Parish Churches in all Cities, Corporations, or Places aforesaid, though their example might have drawn many (as mine did where I was.)

11. Ministers and Corporations and Vestries, were not then bound to swear or subscribe, that it is *unlawful on any pretence whatsoever to resist any commissioned by the King*; when the Keeper of his Seal may sign Commissions to seize on the Kings Forts, Garrisons, Navies, and Treasuries, to deliver up the Kingdoms to Foreigners, to destroy Parliaments, Cities, and Laws: I am sure *Hooker*, *Bilson*, or Arch-Bishop *Abbot*, subscribed not this, nor were such Conformists. Are all these no difference of case?

Sett. 8. There is 2. a great difference in the drift and tendency of the Impositions. They were at first to quiet a Popish Nation, while the true Doctrine took possession and rooting, and to avoid the cavils of those Papists that charged the Reformers with forsaking all the Church: But what they have been used for these last forty or fifty years, I leave the Reader to judge.

1. By the Complaints of all the Parliaments, since then, save one.
2. By the History of Arch-Bishop *Laud's* Tryal.
3. By Dr. *Heylin's* History of his Life.
4. By the writings of Divines, such as Mr. *Thorndike*, Dr. *Parker*, Dr. *Pierce*, Arch-Bishop *Bromhall*, and many more such; and by the Papists historical collection out of such.

See Dr. *Heylin's* description of the Reconciling Plot, *Anno* 1639.

Arch Bishop *Bromhal* saith, *Vindicat.* p. 19. &c. “[Whereas Mr. Baxter doth accuse Grotius as a Papist, I think he doth him wrong, nay I am confident he doth him wrong.—And I have read all that he alledgeth to prove it, but without any conviction or alteration in my judgment.—I will endeavour to give some further light what was the Religion of *Grotius*: He was in affection a friend, and in desire a true Son of the Church (a) of England: And on his Deathbed recommended that Church, as it was legally established to his Wife, and such other of his Family as were then about him, obliging them by his Authority to adhere firmly to it.]

The said Bishop (though no Papist) saith, *pag.* 81. “(b) [I know no members of the Greek Church, who give them (the Papists) either more or less than I do: (Compare this with the Council at *Florence*, and the Patriarch *Jeremiah's* Writings, and the present sence of the Greek

(a) The new Church since Bishop *Laud's* change. (b) Note that the Bishops Book as against me, runs upon a mere filition, p. 76. that I traduce him as a Factor for Popery, when I had not a word to that purpose; yea expressly excepted him by name, though I argued against his too near approach.

“Church, and we may know his mind :) But my ground is not the authority of the Greek Church, but the authority of the Primitive Fathers, and General Councils, which are the representative Body of the Universal Church. (c) *P. 82.* [To wave their last four hundred years determinations, is implicitly to renounce all the necessary causes of this great Schism. (d) And to rest satisfied with their old Patriarchal power and dignity, and Primacy of Order, (which is another part of my Proposition) is to quit the modern Papacy, name and thing. (e)

“*Pag. 84, 85.* [That Christians may joyn together in the same publick devotions and service of Christ,——1. If the Bishop of Rome were reduced from the Universality of Sovereign Jurisdiction, *jure divino*, to his *principium unitatis*, and his Court regulated by the Canons of the Fathers, which was the sence of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, and is desired by many Roman Catholicks, as well as we. 2. If the Creed were reduced to what they were in the time of the four first General Councils, with only necessary explications, and those made by the Authority of a General Council. 3. And some things whence offences have been given or taken, be put out of the Divine Offices——Whether Christians ought not to live in holy Communion, and come to the same publick worship of God, free from all schismatical separations. (f)

“*Pag. 93.* 1. That *St. Peter* had a fixed Chair at *Antioch*, and after at *Rome*, is a truth.——2. That *St. Peter* had a Primacy of Order among the Apostles, is the unanimous voice of the Primitive Church.——3. Some Fathers and Schoolmen who were no sworn Vassals to the Roman Bishop, do affirm that this Primacy of Order is fixed to the Chair of *St. Peter*.

“*P. 97.* Though the Bishop of *Rome* had such a Primacy of Order by Divine Right or Humane, it would not prejudice us at all, nor is worth the contending about. But, 1. It is not by Divine Right in *foro exteriori*. 2. Nor elsewhere (*interiore*) but executive according to the Canons. (g)

(c) No such thing, but of the Churches within the Empire then. (d) was there no necessary cause till after, *An. 1200*? (e) So then these Protestant Bishops give the Pope Patriarchal Power, and Primacy of Order, and as much as the Greeks: But 1. They had by Councils of old no Patriarchal Power over other Kingdoms out of the Empire. 2. Obedience to the Pope as a Patriarch, is against the Oath of Supremacy, and on the matter little differeth our case from obeying him as Pope. (f) So that this Arch-Bishop also was set on the pious design of joyning with the Papists on these terms, and may not we have leave to worship God on better terms? (g) That is, 1. The Pope is not to govern us arbitrarily, but by Canons, (which what they are is hardly known.) 2. And all will be Schismatics, that so obey him not.

Whereas I said that Protestants that consent not to the Popes Patriarchal Power over us in the West, will fall under the reproach of Schism; he saith, *p. 104. &c.* [Must a man quit his just right because some dislike it? Their dislike is but scandal taken, but the quitting of that which is right for their satisfaction, should be scandal given. (h) If they be forced to fall under the reproach of Schismatics, it is by their own wilful humors, or erroneous Conscience, other force there is none. 2. Whether is the worse and more dangerous condition, to fall under the reproach of Schism, or to fall into Schism it self? Whosoever shall oppose the just power of a lawful Patriarch lawfully proceeding, is a material Schismatick at least.—*P. 107.* It's unsound arguing to deny a man his just right for fear lest he may abuse it, as a Patriarchal Power was the Bishop of Rome's just right. They who made the Bishop of Rome a Patriarch were the Primitive Fathers, not excluding the Apostles and Christian Emperors and Oecumenical Councils: what Laws they made in this case we are bound to obey for Conscience sake, till lawfully repealed by vertue of the Law of Christ. (i)

Much more he hath to this purpose, and *p. 112.* for uniting the Church Catholick on humane terms, and *p. 117.* against the peoples liberty of reading and interpreting Scripture; and after at large that concord must be on humane terms, *p. 122.* [*Grotius* judgment was, and mine is moderate,] but had not this man been so owned by many now, I had not cited so much of his. And for *Grotius*, I have over and over cited his own words, and shall not now repeat them: And was this the drift of Conformity of old?

3. *Seck. 9.* Another difference is in the effects; for with us, things not universally or absolutely determined by God, are to be used or refused as they do more good or hurt. 1. Then open Preaching and gathering Assemblies by Nonconformists, would have greatly offended the Prince; but our King at *Breda*, and in his three first Declarations, and by his Licenses, and connivence, shewed such wisdom and clemency, as intimated

(h) 1. Thus for union with Rome, all Protestants must pass for self made Schismatics, that cannot obey the Pope as Patriarch: And doth this tend indeed to Concord? It would open Protestants eyes, did I but tell you all that is in the Canons, which the Pope as our Patriarch must rule us by, as these Doctors do desire. (i) 1. If this Doctrine be true, no wonder that Mr. Thorndike thought we could not justify our Reformation, till we alter the Oath of Supremacy; then we are bound in conscience to a Foreign Jurisdiction. 2. I have fully proved many great errors and sins to be decreed by many of the Councils, by which the Pope, as Patriarch, must rule us all. 3. Is it any easier to do evil Inobedience to a Patriarch than a Pope? 4. In my last Book against W. Johnson, alias Tenet, I have fully confuted all that he saith of the universality of Councils, and the Patriarchs power over the Abassines, and others without the Empire, and shewed they were then all but in one Empire, as the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury is in England.

less displeasure at our liberty. 2. It would have deprived most of the Nonconformists of their hopes of publick liberty in the Parish Churches, which most of them enjoyed; but we had neither possession nor expectation of such a thing. 3. It would have hindered and hazarded the progress of the Reformation, but our preaching hath done more to stop the progress of the Syncretism, or of Popery: Others know this whatever you frivolously say against it. 4. Few of the most ignorant that needed them would then have left the Parish Churches, to hear Nonconformists in private; but now many will come to us that cannot get in to the Parish Churches: Other different effects may be named.

Sett. 10. 4. And though I accuse you not, you that unjustly said before that I made you seem a *company of perjured Villains*, seems to think your self that the forealleged causes make many of the people think little better of some; and a Church thought to consist of such Pastors and Vestries, &c. (essential parts) differ from those that do not. 2. And the multitude of Atheists and filthy livers, and the thousands of Noncommunicants who are still taken for real members of your Churches, have now stood out against so long means and patience, that the reasons of longer waiting for Reformation, much differs from theirs in the beginning. 3. The Canon at first did not *ipso facto*, excommunicate all that do but profess themselves Nonconformists, as since it did. 4. The Bishops and their Canoneers had not then cast out 2000, nor near so many Preachers as now, and so did not so much tempt the people to flee from them as persecutors, thorns, thistles, or wolves. 5. When one Bishop cast any out, some other usually would endure them, but now it was not so. 6. The people saw daily, that you bore with those as no Schismatics, that never communicated nor *used* to hear you, even the greater half of many Parishes, and took them for Church members as is said; and therefore they had reason to hope that they that communicated somewhere with Protestants especially that communicated also with your own Churches, were as good Members, and by good Pastors, would be as well endured.

Sett. 11. 5. Lastly, The forenamed causes of our preaching much differ. 1. We saw the Kingdom (though under usurpers) engaged by Vow, Practice, and about sixteen years possession and custom, to another way; and who could expect that a Law should presently change them all, and assure them of absolution. 2. They that conformed were the more averse, to see about six thousand Ministers that had gone the other way, so suddenly change; as to declare assent and consent to a Book which they never saw. 3. The case of the Plague, the burning of the Churches, the Kings Licenses, &c. I named before, which verily made a great difference. 4. And the numbers that

that call to us for help makes a great difference, when then they that needed them most, did not desire it. These are some differences.

Sett. 12. p. 95. He saith, *There is no reason of separation because of the doctrine of our Church.*] *Answ.* But now you have corrupted it, in the Article of Infants undoubted salvation before described, (and before by the doctrines about Prelacy, Godfathers power and duty, Impositions, &c. implied in your practical Canons) there is great cause of Nonconformity.

P. 96. Repeateth that great mistake, that [*there are no alterations, in our own judgment, which make the terms of Communion harder than before.*]

Answ. What hope then of being understood? how far is this from truth? The terms are far harder to Ministers? and to the people they are easier in some things (as amending some translations, &c.) but it is not to them a small matter to make such a change of their Pastors, as in too many Parishes is made. The Bishop promised them at *Kidderminster*, when he forbade me to preach, that they should be no losers by the change: They said (and I had great reason to believe them) that the Successor knew so little of the sense of the Creed, and preach'd so rarely (four times a year) I am loth to tell you how, that they durst not be guilty of encouraging him in undertaking the charge of Souls, nor durst take him for their Pastor: And the great increase of buildings in *London*, shuts thousands now out of such Parish Churches, who could have got in heretofore; and some more differences are before implied. p. 97. As other Churches own your Churches, so do we, though not your imposed sins.

Sett. 13. p. I was in hope to have met with some answer to my importunate Question, [*What would you have the many score thousands do, that cannot come within your Churches to hear?*] But no importunity will prevail for so small a matter with *inexorable men*. But he saith, 1. that [*this is but a pretence.*] 2. And that [*no man denyeth that more places are desirable, &c.*] *Answ.*

1. It is me that he is now accusing! why doth he barely say and not prove, that it's but a pretence? I never set up a Meeting place, but in *St. Martins* Parish, where are said to be forty thousand more than can come within the Church: And when they would not suffer me to use it, I gladly left it to the use of the Parish Minister. I preach now twice a week elsewhere, but both the places are in Neighbourhoods, where many thousands cannot hear in the Parish Churches. What if other men have other sufficient reasons (as the utter incapacity of some Ministers, or the like) doth it follow that my own case and professed reason is a meer pretence? why then did I use no publick preaching, while I lived in such Villages where the people might go to Church? and why did I constantly twice a day lead them thither, though some disliked it? 2. The question is not whether *more Churches*

es are desirable? But where they are not, whether many thousands must live like Atheists, without all publick teaching or Divine Worship, for fear of being called Schismaticks. Is not this plainly to chuse damnation? If the Gospel be needless, why do we wish the Heathens had it? Why subscribe you against mens hopes of being saved in all their several Religions? If Church worship be needless, why is a Clergy to be so honoured, and maintained at so dear a rate? And why do you make such a stir with Separatists to bring them to your Churches? Can men, not blinded by interest, chuse but wonder, that so many thousands in a Parish should be taken for Church Members, and live quietly, that come not to any Church, or never communicate with any, and yet that godly persons who hear and communicate with their old tryed Pastors (yea with such as communicate with you) should be preach'd and written against as Schismaticks, and judg'd to that which some endure. Did this Dr. think that to drop in the case of other men, when he was at a loss, would make good his charge against me, and such as I: Mr. *Tombes* and Mr. *Williams* preached other doctrine; do I do so, and have you proved it?

But seeing he will needs bring the case to *Kidderminster*, whether I would suffer Mr. *Tombes* to gather a Congregation, I must not balk it; but advise him hereafter to keep himself at a greater distance, and not to put his own followers, who are willing enough to believe him, upon utter impossibilities: He sped better with them when he laid the scene an hundred years backward, or as far off as *New England*; let him know then all these things in confutation of his historical supposition. 1. That *Kidderminster* Parish hath but about three thousand or four thousand souls, and the Church so fit (with five Galleries) that all may hear: But his Parish is said to have twenty thousand souls, of which not four thousand can hear. 2. A considerable part of *Kidderminster* Parish, called *Ridnal*, being at *Bewdly Bridge* end, and two miles from *Kidderminster*, (and some Villages more) usually were Mr. *Tombes* his hearers at *Bewdley*, and I never blamed them. 3. After him, they were Hearers and Communicants to his Successor Mr. *Oasland*, and he took the Pastoral care of them (that desired any;) and I was so far from blaming him, that I greatly thanked him, and we were far from disagreeing. 4. Though Mr. *Tombes* and I differed in the doctrine of Infant Baptism, I gave him leave (yea and the Quakers too) in the publick Church many hours together, to say all that they could for their opinions in the hearing of my Auditors, and none of them ever won one of them that I heard of, (yet the Dr. supposeth some great danger of their peoples seduction, if they hear such as I that never were accused of false Doctrine. 5. But he hath chosen an instance yet neerer our present case: Another part of *Kidderminster*

minster Parish is neer three miles off, at a Village called *Minton*; where at the Chappel I found a Curate called Mr. *Turner*, infamous for drunkennells, fighting, living on unlawful marriage, and for gross ignorance: (I tried him, and perceived not that he understood much of the Creed,) I sent them a worthy Preacher once a day first, and twice after, and declared my utter dissent to Mr. *Turner*'s Ministry; yet because some of the Church of *England* would have him, and he would, against my will, read the Common Prayer to them once a day, I hindred them not from their choice, but they went on. 6. And the sequestred Vicar in the Town (Mr. *Dance*) was generally taken to be as ignorant as he, so that when once a quarter he went into the Pulpit, his own Wife, though of the Church of *England*, would for shame go out of Church: Yet did I never forbid him to preach, and he oft read the Common Prayer at Sir *Ralph Clares*, and I suppose gave them the Sacrament. 7. I had opportunity then to have hindred all this if I would have used Magistrates: They were both by Proclamation to remove two miles off, but neither of them once removed so much as out of their houses, nor did I desire it; but we are by law driven five miles off. 8. Mr. *Dance* had forty pounds a year allowed him, and Mr. *Turner* never had a groat of his ancient Salary diminished, when another was put in, but the other paid otherwise; but we ask you nothing for assisting you. 9. I had never one hundred pounds to my self, and therefore could maintain no more help; (two Assistants I had) but have you no more to maintain Assistants? Now judge how well your historical Instances serve your turn.

And besides the number of Souls, very many Parishes are so wide, that distance forbiddeth many to come to the publick Parish Churches: Some Villages are five miles, some four, and many three miles off; and how can Families, especially Women, Children, and the aged, and especially in winter, go so far twice (or once) a day: And must all these forbear to hear, or to worship God, for fear of being counted Schismatics?

Because the Dr. appealeth to my self, I seriously profess that when I had a Pastoral Charge, (which was but in one place) I would have been very thankful to any one that differed no more than the Dr. and I do, that would have gathered a Congregation of such, as for number or distance could not have come into the Parish Church; and the case of distance did occasion the honest separation aforesaid, though the case of numbers did not: Yea when hundreds desired Communion according to the Common Prayer, I never offered to hinder any of them from taking it where and how they would.

SECT. 14. P. 99. He saith [This is Mr. Baxter's own Case—when he is pinched with the Point of Separation, thus he declares, that his hearers are
the

the same with ours ; at least ten or twenty for one.—If this be true, then what such mighty help is this to our great Parishes, what colour or pretence is there from the largeness of them, that he should preach to the very same men that come to our Church.—Then how come they to be lawful when few or none of those many thousands ever come.—to speak softly this pretence is not becoming Mr. Baxters Sincerity.

Ans. what hope of Justice from such Judges ? Or what hope of profiting such Readers by Dispute, as cannot answer such as this themselves. When I began to preach at St. James's the neighbours assured me, that many of the hearers had been at no Church of four years ; but they were Members of the Parish-Church, and that some of them got into the Church, but rarely : and some liked it not so well as to be forward seekers. When I was driven thence, I preached a while where Mr. Wadsworth was in Southwark : There were some people that had adhered to their old ejected worthy Pastor, and some that I knew not. Since then I preach once on the Lords day in another mans Pulpit, as near St. James's as I could, and the same persons that heard me there do (many of them) come hither, and some others : of all whom I know very few, but by report. On Thursdays I preach a Lecture in another mans Pulpit to persons of whom I know not many : but report saith, that some of them joyn not ordinarily with the Parish Ministers, and some do, and most judge it lawful, and sometime, but seldom practise it : And those are of two sorts : some that prefer the Nonconformists Ministry, and some that finding the Parish Churches crowded, and many present are out of hearing, do seldom go thither, though they are of the Parish Churches, and dissent not from their Ministry or Worship : some say [we have no Seats and cannot stand:] some say [we cannot hear the Minister :] some say, *Thousands stay away that can get no room, and will go no whither else, and when we can go elsewhere, we will not crowd in first to keep them out, that so much need Others must be out if we be in.* These are your own Church-Members : they hear you sometimes, but seldom. Others that hear you constantly on the Lords days, will think that a Sermon on the week days may be needful to them whatever you think or say against it. And is it *inconsistent with Sincerity* here to plead the peoples necessity. It's well that our Sincerity is not to stand or fall to your judgment. Did I say that my hearers are *constant hearers* in your Churches ? Can you persuade the World, while you deny not that half or a quarter of your own Parish cannot hear you (much less many greater Parishes) that if some of them do but sometimes crowd in, perhaps once in many months or weeks, by coming with the first, and do but dwell in the Parish and own you, that they have no need to hear or worship God

L

publickly

publickly all the rest of the year, and to pretend such need becometh not Sincerity.

2. And as to those that meet in lesser Parishes, you thought not meet to take notice of my answer, assigning many Reasons, which I will not repeat, any further than to tell you. 1. That many Churches there are unbuilt. 2. Many come from the greater Parishes to them : and some have other Reasons.

Seet. 15. P. 102. He saith [*Mr. Baxter hath a whole Chapter (Plea p. 141.) of Reasons against the Communion of Laymen with our Church.*] *Answ.* You are unhappy in History, though it be your strength. There's not a word to prove it unlawful for Laymen to have Communion with your Churches, but only the Matter of Fact named, which is supposed to the Controversie; But it being cunningly worded by you, it may be by [*Reasons against Communion with our Churches,*] you meant but as I did (*Reasons for Nonconformity in those particular Acts :*) But do you not your self all-along suppose and plead, that though we conform not, yet we should hold Communion with you. Why call you then the Reasons of Nonconformity, Reasons against Communion.

Seet. 16. P. 103. He adds [*in the same Books he saith, it is Schismatical in a Church to deny Baptism without the transient Sign of the Cross, or for want of God-fathers, &c. or to deny Communion to such who scruple kneeling.* Now if the Church be Schismatical, then those who separate in these things are not.

Answ. 1. Say you so ! Then we are not only quit, but further quit than we can own our selves. Undertake to prove that it may be Schism to separate from a Church that is guilty of some Schismatical Acts and Impositions. And it needs no proof, but the plain History, and their Accusations of one another ; that there are few, if any Churches on Earth that are not guilty of somewhat that is Schismatical, in *East, West, North or South, in Africk, Asia, Europe or America ;* Greeks, Muscovites, Jacobites, Abassines, Nestorians, Armenians, Georgians, Mengrelians, Circassians, Papists, Lutherans, Calvinists, Prelaticalls, Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptists, &c. And must we separate from them all.

2. Verily Sir, denying Persons, *Christendom and Church-Communion* are great things. And if a *Cross and a gesture forbidden by the Ancient Councils in Adoration every Lords Day*, be now matters so weighty, as for them to deny Christendome and Communion, for shame call them *Indifferent* no more : one would verily think that when you writ your Defence of Archbishop *Laud* you had been of another mind, if words are any notifying Signs of your mind. 3. Other Pastors may be used, in such instances without

without separating from you, Sir these are not impossibilities to peaceable men. In both the places where I formerly preached, a *publick Minister* and a *private* lovingly joyn as assistants, one doing that part which the other cannot. And they all live in peace.

Sett. 17. I am next assaulted *Pag. 110.* I say [*The Benefit of Christian Love and Concord may make it best, for certain seasons, to joyn even in defective Modes of Worship, as Christ did, &c. though the least defective must be chosen when no such Reasons sway the other way.*] Reader, is not this true? Will not the denial of this drive us from the Parish Churches, and from almost all, or require us causelessly to choose sins of omission. Would you not take him for a separatist that is against this. But he saith [*And hence we take notice 1. That no Obligation to the Peace and Unity of this Church as they are Members of it, doth bring them to this occasional Communion with it; but a certain Romantick Fancy of Catholick Unity by which these Catholick Gentlemen think themselves no more obliged to the Communion of this Church, then of the Armenian or Abissine Churches: Only it happens that our Church is so much nearer.*

Ans. 1. This is not true: For 1. we take this Church to be far less corrupt than the *Armenian* or *Abissine*. 2. We have more Obligations to it from the civil Magistrates, Laws and Protection, &c. 2. Is nearness such a trifle with you. How much do you differ from Mr. *Cheny*. Tell us, why we should be of your Parish Church rather than of one an hundred miles off, but for nearness and Cohabitation; why else of old had each City its own Church? 3. *Is Catholick Unity become a Romantick Fancy.* Is this the same man that wrote the Defence of Archbishop *Laud*, we are not ashamed of the title of Catholick. 4. If I name *one Obligation* to Communion with you, is it a learned Note to gather that I deny all other? 5. When prove you that I am only for *occasional Communion* when I have so long practised *constant Communion* with you? These are reasons suitable to your cause.

Sett. 18. He adds [*Ask him what Church he is a Member of: If he answer, he could have occasional Communion with all tolerable Churches, but was a fixed Member of none, would they (if he were at Jerusalem) take such a man for a Christian? What? a Christian and a Member of no Church. And I much doubt whether they would admit such an one to occasional Communion, &c.* Ans. 1. Wonderful! Who would have thought that this man had been so much for the Principles of Separation (more than the Independants) In his defence of *Laud* he maintaineth that the *Power of the Keys* is formally in the whole Church, and given to Peter as their Representative (which is not true, for it was given only to Pastors as such and not to the Laity.) And now he would make that man *no Christian* that is no *fixed Member* of some particular Church. Let us examine whether this be true.

C H A P. V I.

Q. *Whether he be no Christian that is not a fixed Member of a particular Church ?*

Sect. 1. **H**E that is a true Member of the Universal Church, which is Christs Body, is a true Christian : But many are Members of the Universal Church, which are no fixed Members of any particular Church. *Ergo.*

2. All that are rightfully Baptized are Christians, (for it is their Christening.) *But many rightfully Baptized are no fixed Members of any particular Church. Ergo.*

3. He that hath all the Essentials of Christianity is a Christian : But many that are no fixed Members of a particular Church have all the Essentials of Christianity. *Ergo.*

4. *A fortiore,* They that are not so much as bound in Duty to be fixed Members of a particular Church, though Baptized, are not unchristened for want of such Membership. But many Baptized person are not so much as bound in Duty to be fixed Members of a particular Church. *Ergo.* Instances.

1. The Eunuch baptized in his Travails *Acts. 9.* was only a Member of the Church Universal. 2. Those that were converted by *Frumenius* and *Edesius* when there was no particular Church : And all that are first converted in any Infidel or Heathen Land before any Church be formed. 3. Those that by Shipwrack are cast on heathen Countries where no Churches are. 4. Travellers that go from Country to Countries (as *Lythgow* did nineteen years, and others many.) And I think he unhappily named *Jerusalem*, where Travellers come that are of no fixed Church (unless he in that also be a Superindendant, and think that men may be many years Members of a Church many hundred miles off, which they have no personal communion with.) 5. Merchants and Factors, who are called to dwell long among Infidels where are no Churches. 6. Embassadors who by their Princes are sent to reside among such, much of their lives. 7. Wanderers that have no fixed habitations ; as many Pedlers and other poor wandering Tradesmen, and loose Beggars that have no Dwelling. 8. Those that live among Papists or any other Christians who impose some sin as a condition of communion. 9. Those that live among such Christians as have no true Pastors who are constitutive parts
of

of particular Churches. Some being incapable through insufficiency, some by Heresie and some for want of a true Call : Such as by Mr *Dodwells* Doctrine most of the Christian World are, for want of uninterrupted true Episcopal Ordination. 10. Those who are subjects to such as permit them not to be fixed Members : As Wives hindred by Husbands, Children by Parents, and some Subjects violently hindred by Princes ; who yet allow them transient Communion. And verily a man would think by the writings of many Conformists, that they took it for a Duty to obey a Prince in such a case. 11. Those who live where Church-corruptions are not so great as to make transient Communion unlawful, but so great as to make fixed communion seem to be a culpable consent : If I come in travel to a Church of Strangers, I am not bound to examine what their *Discipline is*, what their *Lives be*, or how their *Pastors are called* : But where I am fixed I am more bound to know these, and if I find them exclude Discipline, live wickedly, and have unlawful Pastors, I may in some cases be a partaker of the sin if I fix among them. 12. They that live in a time and place of Schism and distraction, striving who shall prevail, and condemning each other, all following several Factions, and needing Reconcilers : It may for a time become in prudence the duty of peacemakers, to own no Faction, nor to be more of one Church than of another, while he seeth that it will do more hurt than good ; And those that wait in hope as the Nonconformists now do, to see whether their Rulers will restore them to reformed Parish Churches, may at once in prudence find it needful, neither to fix as Members in some Parish Churches till reformed (in the Teachers at least) nor to seem to be Separatists by gathering new Churches. In none of all these cases is a man unchristened, nor schismatical, for being no fixed member of any Church besides the Universal. And as it is the ill hap of these men commonly to strike themselves, I doubt they will prove *Grotius* himself no Christian, by this Rule, who for many years before he died, they say joyned with no particular Church, as a fixed member. And I know not well what particular Church they make the King a Member of.

Self. 2. To his Questions *Pag.* 3. [*Were we not Baptized into this Church, and do you not Renounce Membership ? This is scarce a civility.* I answer, 1. This Church ! which Church do you mean ? I was not Baptized into *St. Giles's* nor *St. Andrew's* Parish Church, but into one above an hundred miles off, and yet my removal made me no culpable Separatist. Or doth he mean, This *Diocesan Church* ? No ; I was Baptized in the Diocess of *Lichfield*. Doth he mean *This National Church* ; as it is supposed a political body constituted of the Ecclesiastical Governing and Governed

Parts, he saith there is no such Church of *England*; but that It inferreth Popery to assert such. But if he equivocate here, and mean not by a Church as in the rest, but either a *christian Kingdom*, or an *agreeing Association* of many Churches, I am still a fixed member of such a Kingdom, and of such an Association in all things necessary to Churches and Christian Communion. 2. But *Baptism as such* entred me only into the Universal Church; much less did it fix me in any other. I was Baptized where I was to stay but a little while. And this phrase of [*being Baptized into our Church,*] is to me of ill sound or intimation. *Bellarmino* saith that all that are baptized are interpretatively thereby engaged to the Pope: I was baptized in a Parish, and in a Diocess, and in a Christian Kingdom; but not so *into them*, as to be obliged to continue under that Priest or Bishop or in that Kingdom. And my Baptism I hope did not oblige me to every Canon, Ceremony, Form, or Sin of the associated Churches in *England*, abusively by him called *one Church*. 3. And unhappily it is not meer Independancy that he is still pleading for, but some extremes which the moderate Independants disclaim, *viz.* That a member of their Churches is so tyed to them, that they may not remove to another without their consent. And am I so tyed? to what, to Parochial, or to the Diocesan, or to the association of English Churches. If it had been to the *Species*, I would fain know whether their things called by them *Indifferents* specifie them.

Sect. 3. P. 111, 112. He yet more pleads as for Separation [*why then above once or twice? why should I so countenance defective Worship and not rather reprove it by total forbearance of Communion,*] &c. *Answ.* My Reasons I told him, because the accidents may continue which made it a Duty, but I cannot hinder others from yielding to his arguments: Let him make his best of them. Only I must tell him yet 1. that if he lay his cause on this, that their Parochial or Diocesan Churches are not defective. 2. Or that the defects cannot by others be avoided, he will quite marr his matter, and undo all by overdoing. 3. And if he indeed think that all defective Churches must be forsaken, he will be one of the greatest Schismatics in the World. But who can reconcile this with the scope of his whole Book?

Sect. 4. P. 112. He saith, *Here are no bounds set to peoples Fancies of purer Administrations.* *Answ.* Have I so oft and copiously named the bounds, and now is the answer, [*Here are none.*] Are there none in all the same Books he citeth? 2. Scripture is their bounds, as he well openeth in his defence of Bishop *Laud*.

Sect. 5. P. 114. He complains of my leaving out the best part of his

his argument, viz. [*The people may go to the Anabaptists and Quakers.*]

Answ. Alas that such things should be the best to such a man! By [*May go*] you mean, 1. *lawfully*, 2. *or eventually*, 3. *or for want of due hindring.* The Reader may think that you by Calumny father the first on me, as if I said, that so to go to the Quakers were no sin, whereas I still say that if they do but leave your Churches by any culpable Error it is their sin: 2. And as to the *Event*, many not only *may* but *do*, turn Quakers, Papists and Athiests, 3. And as to the third, it's all the question here (not whether we should seek to save them but) which is the true reasonable and allowed means, Whether it be the Patrons choosing for all *England* the Pastors to whose care they must trust their Souls, and laying them in Jail that will choose others? Or whether there be not a righter way: And again I say, Kings and Patrons choose not mens Wives, or Physicians, or Food, and every man hath a charge of his Soul as well as of his Life, *Antecedent to the Kings or Patrons charge.*

Seet. 6. But why (saith he P. 11. v. 115.) must the King bear all the blame, if mens Souls be not provided for, &c? *Answ.* He that is the chooser must bear the blame, the King for Bishops, and the Patrons for Parish Priests if they mischoose. And do you think in your conscience that all the Patrons in *England* of so various minds and lives, are like to choose only such, in whose pastoral conduct all that care for their Souls should rest. Yea though the Bishops must Institute them as they Ordained them. When we heretofore told them of the multitudes of grossly ignorant, drunken Priest, their answers were, 1. Their Chaplains examined them. 2. They had certificates. 3. *A quare impedit* lay against them if they required higher knowledge than to answer the Catechism in Latine. And now experience will not warrant us to know what such men are. *P. 115.* He asketh *How it is possible on these terms to have any peace or order in an established Church.* *Answ.* I have fully told him how in a whole Book of concord, And hath their way caused greater peace and order? Yes, to themselves for the time. So Popery keepeth some Order and Unity with them that hold to it: But it kept not the Greeks or Protestants from forsaking them.

Seet. 7. P. 119. 120. He saith, [*They only look on those as true Churches which have such Pastors whom they approve.*] *Answ.* Equivocal words: 1. If they approve not those whom they should approve, it is their sin. 2. *Approving* is either of the *necessaries ad esse*, or only *ad melius esse*. They must not put the later for the former. 3. *Approving* is by a *Governing* or but a *discerning private Judgment*. The first they have not, but the later. In good earnest, would he have all the people take those for true Pastors,

Pastors, who they verily think are none. Can they at once hold contradictions? And if they must not judge as dissenters, what meaneth Mr. *Dodwell* and such mens Arguments to prove all no Ministers that have not Succession of Episcopal Ordination? Must not the people on that account disown them, by his way?

Sett. 8. p. 119. He brings in against us my words [*I take those for true Churches that have true Pastors, and those for none, that have* 1. *Men incapable of the Pastoral Office,* 2. *or not truly called to it,* 3. *Or that deny themselves the essential Power.* *Answ.* He knoweth that I speak not of equivocal but proper political Churches. And is it possible that such a man should dissent in this? 1. *Can he be a true Pastor that is incapable of the Office?* Shall I abuse time to confute gross Contradictions? Or if he be a profest Infidel, Can he be a Christian Pastor? 2. *Is a Layman a true Pastor that is not truly called to it?* why then do they argue as Mr. *Dodwell*? or Re-ordain men. 3. *Can a man be a Pastor against his will, or that consenteth not, but renounceth it?* or can that be a true Pastoral Church that hath no Pastor? Verily we are but upon low works, if these be the things which we must prove.

Sett. 9. He adds, [*And one or other of these he thinks must, if not all the parochial Churches in England fall under.*] *Answ.* I read these words of the Dr. to a Papist, [*To speak mildly, this is a gross untruth.*] Therefore I hope it were no *Rage* for me to have said the like. How doth he prove it? Nay in the place cited by him I not only profest the contrary, but gave the Reason, p. 65. [*Because I judge of their Office by Gods Word, and not by the Rule which deprives them of an essential Part.*] And 1. He citeth my confession that those that I hear preach well (and therefore are not incapable men.) 2. That their Ordination hath all essentially necessary, and all the worthy men that I know have the communicants of the Parishes consent, though not Election, and therefore are called, 3. And many of them (as he) thinks they have all essential to the Office and disown it not, though I think others deny it them, where there is the truth of what he saith.

Sett. 10. p. 120. *Because my practice disproveth him, he finds out a Subtilty, that I joyne not with the Parish Churches as true Churches, but only as Chappels or Oratories—he accounts not our parochial Churches as true Churches, nor doth communicate with them as such—a Subtilty beyond the reach of the old Brownists.* *Answ.* Deliberately to print such untruths seems tolerable in him, but to say they are such would seem passion in me, and what other answer are they capable of?—What I expressly say of the three fore-mentioned excepted sorts, he feigneth me to say of all or most of the Parish

Parish Churches; and yet dare not deny the truth of any one of the Exceptions. 1. Do not all those men take the Parishes for no proper political Churches, but only for *Parts* of the *Diocesan Church*, such as we call *Curates Chappels*, who say that a *Bishop* is a *constitutive Part* of a *true* political Church and entereth the Definition, and that it's no Church that hath no Bishop, and that *Diocesan Churches* are the lowest political. And do I need to tell him how considerable these men are among them. 2. Doth he himself take any one of these for a true political Church? When I was young, divers Laymen by turns were our publick Reading Teachers: Among the rest one was after proved to counterfeit *Orders*. This mans acts were no nullities to us that knew it not: but when we knew of such must we take them for true Pastors, and it for a true Church?

Se^{ct}. 11. p. 221. He saith, [*Any Parochial Church that hath such a one (a Bishop or Pastor over them that hath the power of the Keys, and owns it self to be Independant) he allows to be a true Church and none else.*] *Ans*w. More and more untruths. 1. Where do I say [*that owns it self to be Independant,*] as if that were necessary to its being. 1. Doth he not confess that I own general Visitors or Archbishops and appeals? 2. That I own *Associations* which he makes the state of the Church of *England*? 3. That I own Synods for obliging concord? 4. That I own the Magistrates Government of all? Is there no dependancy in any of these, or all? what dependancy more doth he assert? 2. As to the *Power* of the *Keys*, dare he come into the light and tell us, whether *any power of the Keys*, that is, of the Government of his particular Church be essential to the Pastor of a true organized governed Church or not. If not, is it not a contradiction to call it a *governed Church*? If yea then is he a Pastor that wants what is essential to a Pastor? But if they will call a *forcing Power*, or the present secular Mode of their Courts, by the name of the *Keys*, I never said that these are essential to a Church, nor desirable in it, but am a Nonconformist because I will not by Oath or Covenant renounce (just) Endeavours to amend it.

Se^{ct}. 12. p. 121, 122. The next Accusation is, [*They leave it in the peoples Power notwithstanding all legal Establishments to own or disown whom they judge fit.*] *Ans*w. He tireth me with putting me on repetitions. 1. They can unjustly judge of none and disown them without sin. It is not I that give men power to sin, no more than *Power to die*, or be *sick*, which is but impotency: would I could give them power against it. 2. It is not power to reject any chosen by King or Patrons, from being publick Teachers, or to have the Tithes and Temples, nor to be a Pastor to others. But it is to have a *discerning Judgment* whether one chosen by the Patron be a person to whom he himself ought to trust the pastoral Conduct of his Soul. Either the Dr

thinks that Laymen have this discerning power and duty or not. If yea, is it nothing to him to seem thus seriously to plead against his conscience? If not, I ask him, 1. What meant Christ and his Apostles to call men to beware of false Teachers, to avoid the Leaven of their Doctrine, to mark them and avoid them, and turn away from them, and not bid them good speed? 2. What meant all the ancient Churches to forbid Communion with Hereticks? and even some Popes and Councils to hear Mass of Fornicators? 3. What meant all those Fathers and Councils, that make him no Bishop that cometh not in with the peoples consent? if not Election. 4. Why will he not be intreated to tell us in what Countries, or with what Limitations the contrary Doctrine must be received? Must all the people trust only such Pastors as the Prince or Patrons choose all over *England*? or also in *Ireland, France, Spain, Italy, Germany*, among Lutherans, Calvinists, Greeks, &c. supposing the Law be on that side? Must we all be of the Kings or Patrons Religion? 5. Is this agreeable to his old Doctrine cited Chap. 1.

Sect. 13. p. 122. He adds, [Mr. Baxter speaks his mind very freely against the Rights and Patronage, and the Power of the Magistrates in such Cases, and pleads for the unalterable Rights of the people, as the old Separatists did. *Ans.* Is this true? 1. What is it against the Right of Patronage or Magistrates Power for me to choose who I will trust the guidance of my Soul with, while I contradict not his power to choose publick Teachers, and give the Tithes and Temples, and confess that for order sake I ought to consent to such as he chooseth thus, unless he put on me a true necessity of a better choice? If the King choose all the Hospital Physicians, what wrong is it to him, if I at my own charge choose a better for my self when I think else ignorance or malice will murder me? Doth he that desireth (as I ever do) that in so great a case there may be many Locks to the Church Door, deny any one of them, viz. The *Ordainers consent*, the Magistrates and Patrons, and the Peoples. Is this the same that the old Separatists did? Should *Glocester* take *Goodman* a Papist for their Bishop because the King chose him? Abundance of Patrons in the beginning of *Q. Elizabeths* Reign presented Papists. It seems if they were imposed by Law, and Patrons, you would have the people submit to those that cry down Bishops, Liturgy and Ceremonies too. Father *Paul Sarpi* translated by Dr. *Denton* will tell you how new a way this is.

Sect. 14. p. 122. He adds [*The People are made Judges of the Competency of their Ministers.*] *Ans.* They are discerning Judges. Doth not your charge imply that you think otherwise; and yet you dare not say so. Must they not judge when Forreigners heretofore were set over them, whether they speak English or no? or if a Socinian deny Christs Godhead or the immortality

mortality of the Soul, whether he be *Competent* or not ? Or if they have an ignorant Curate, that when necessary advice for the Soul is asked of him, will say no more but [*Trouble not your head about such matters, but cast away care and live merrily.*] If when the blind lead the blind both fall into the ditch, must we not note the difference ? Alas how little would some men have a man care for his Soul, in comparison of caring what Physick, what Food, what Wife, what Servant, what Trade he chooseth ? Trust one to the conduct of such as all the Patrons of *England* will choose for you, but not any of the other. As to the not causeless forsaking former Pastors, he knoweth that it was the strict charge of the old *Canons* of the Churches ; and the Bishops themselves do hold the same. I thought they ought not to be forsaken because men thrust them out. The Churches at *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and many more did oft and long cleave to those Pastors whom the Christian Emperors cast out, and reject those whom they imposed. When I have proved this so fully in my first *Plea* and Church-history, what an unsatisfactory answer is it for such a Dr. to repeat it and say, *This is plain dealing.* Is the Judgment and Practice of the Churches so light with him.

Seet. 15. p. 123. The next charge is, [*They give directions to the people what sort of Ministers they should own, and what not.*] *Ans.* We do so : And I had thought all Christians had been of the same mind. It's sad with the Church when this *Doctrine* needeth a publick defence. Dare he say, that all imposed must be owned ? Then either Salvation is at the Magistrates will, or it's the privilege of such Countries as have good ones, or a man may be saved in any Country Religion contrary to the Article which they all subscribe.

Seet. 16. Next the Accuser falls on my general Rule, [*The Ministry that tendeth to Destruction more than to Edification, and to do more harm than good, is not to be owned,*] and his bare recital is confutation. *Ans.* I must profess that I am so confident of this, that a thousand such dissenting Drs. cannot change me : And according to his excellent Rules of judging in the end of his Discourse of Idolatry, which maketh natural Verities most certain and fundamental, me thinks it should to him be surer of the two than the Gospel it self : *viz.* That all men should love themselves, and be unwilling to be damned, and therefore should not own that Ministry of man which tendeth more to Destruction than to Edification. And when he wrote that cited in my first Chap. he was of that mind or he was a most gross dissembler. But must it be otherwise ? Is it our Salvation that we must sacrifice to Priests, Prelates or Princes wills ? If our Tithes would have served them, we had not gainsaid them. If our Bodies and Estates might have satisfied them, we had not stuck at it so much. But when (*Destruction*) signifieth (*Damnation*) it is a hard bargain ? If we should re-

nounce our Christianity for them, we are never the nearer : for we are still *Men* and therefore loth to be destroyed in Hell ? If this be the meaning of the Article which denyeth *free will*, I deny it freely : I have no such *free will*. But O Reverend Fathers, be more impartial : Are you so loth to lose your great Riches and Honor, yea or to have your Reputation so far questioned, as to be contradicted, or have others live by you that preach without your consent ; and yet must all the people of *England*, so much deny their own Salvation for you, as to submit to a destroying Ministry ? Why then did you before put (*agreement in Doctrine*) among the requisites to our Accusation ? must we *agree* and not *judge* whether we agree or not ? Why then must not all Hereticks, Papists, &c. be received, why then are all your voluminous Accusations produced to prove us justly silenced ? and Mr. *Dodwells* to prove us no Ministers of Christ, if we want nothing but a human power to impose us on the Churches, and a Patron to present us ? But the best is, when you have talk'd and written your worst, men will be unwilling of destruction ; and till the Bible be forbidden, men will read, (*Beware of false Prophets : Let no man deceive you : prove all things : from such turn away : Mark them which cause Divisions and Offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learn'd and avoid them*, and more, 2 *Pet.* 2. *f. Tit.* 3. 10. 2. *f.* 10, 11.

Sect. 17. He adds, (*That we may not think all this to be only a Romantick Scheme, or Fiction*,) he adds, (*that they are not able to confute the people in too many places, who tell them that their publick Priests are so defective in their necessary Qualifications for their Office, as that they hold it unlawful to own such for true Ministers, and to encourage them by their presence, and commit the care of their Souls to such.* *Ans.* 1. This is true : we are not able to confute them : If you be rejoice in your Wisdom. 2. Either you would have us believe that *there are none such*, or that no such are to be so refused. The first you attempt not : If you did, I would repeat a Catalogue of my old Teachers and Acquaintance : but I have named them to Mr. *Hinkley*. And as to the second, I prove it (a sad task for such a one as you to put us on.) 1. Such as are known to be no authorized Ministers of Christ, should not be owned as such : But all those that want the necessary Qualifications for their Office are no authorized Ministers of Christ. *Ergo*. If the Major were not true, Error or Lying were a duty. The truth of the Minor is evident in the terms : *necessarium est sine quo res non esse potest*. It is Qualifications necessary to the Office in esse, and not only to the well performance that is mentioned. *Forma nunquam recipitur in materiam dispositione necessaria carentem*. But here the Office is the forme, and the necessary disposition of the matter is supposed wanting. *Ergo*. Again : All men are bound to avoid the apparent means of Damnation : To trust the conduct of our Souls to men incapable for want of necessary

necessary Qualifications, is an apparent means of Damnation (as excluding an ordinarily necessary means of Salvation,) *Ergo*. Again: It is a great sin to encourage men in the wilful damning of their own Souls, and hindering the Salvation of many others: But to own an unqualified incapable man as a Minister of Christ, is to encourage him in the wilful damnation of himself (by his prophane undertaking) and in hindering the salvation of many others, *Ergo*. I will not recite what *Zechary* and other Prophets say of the usage of false pretenders to be Prophets, lest you misapply it. Again: No man ought to consent to the prophane subverting of Christ's Church-Offices and Ordinances: But to consent to the Ministry of unqualified incapable men, is to consent to the subverting of Christ's Church-Offices and Ordinances. *Ergo*. Can your patience endure unqualified men in the Ministry, and cannot endure such as us out of Jail, because we obey you not in all your imposed Oaths, Words and Practises.

Seet. 18. Next he thus confuteth us, (*and directly contrary to the Principles of the old Nonconformists, as appears at large by Mr. Ball saying (If Can's meaning be that it is not lawful to communicate in the Worship of God with Ministers not fitly qualified, disorderly called, or carelessly executing their Office, it is directly contrary to the word of God, sound Reason, and consent of all the Learned. Ans.* Who would have thought that this worthy Doctor could not or would not see a difference, between (*fitly qualified*) as *ad bene esse*, and *unqualified*, or wanting the qualifications necessary *ad esse*, and between (*disorderly called*), and (*not called*, or *consented to by the Flock at all*) and between (*carelessly executing the Office*) and *not having the Office as incapable.*) He will not strain at such gnats as these. And is there no difference between (*lawful Communicating*) and *committing the conduct of mens Souls to them as our stated Pastors.* Mr. Ball lived not far from me: his intimate Friend Mr. *Ash* well knew his mind. You may yet know it fully from Mr. *Cook* of *Chester*, a silenced Minister bred up in his house and sometime one of your old Patrons (*Sr. Roger Burgone*) Nonconformists, after many others at *Rockhal* in *Warwickshire*. Mr. Ball was not such an enemy to distinguishing as to confound *Necessaries ad esse Officii & ad bene esse.*

Seet. 19. But p. 124. I am also brought as against my self for saying (*That a Ministers personal faults do not allow people to separate from the Worship of God. 2. nor all Ministerial faults, but only those that prove him and his Ministratation utterly intolerable. Ans.* 1. A strong proof, that therefore the intolerable may be received, because I say, no: I contradict my self by saying the same things. Personal Faults I distinguished from Ministerial and tolerable Ministerial from intolerable, then and now: and is this Contradiction? Do not all do so too, till now? Yea in the place cited by him

I 1. said, that as to *personal Faults*, as *Swearing*, *Drunkenness*, &c. they should get a better man, if lawfully they can. 2. And I named just as here the intolerable insufficiencies, direct pag. 747. viz. 1. *An utter insufficiency in knowledge and utterance for the necessary parts of the ministerial Work.* 2. *If he set himself to oppose the ends of the Ministry*, &c. by *Heresie*, *Malignity*. And I name the faults that necessitate not Separation.

Sett. 20. Next he citeth my words against some mens Factious separating humor: And doth it follow that because many are unfit to judge aright, that the people must take all obtruded Pastors, and not judge to whom to trust the conduct of their Souls? How unfit are the ignorant to judge who is a meet Physician, Lawyer, Arbitrator, yea or wife or husband for them: And yet judge they must as well as they can: Do you not expect notwithstanding their unfitness, that they judge your Books and arguing to be truer than mine? And is it by your bare authority that they must so judge?

Sett. 21. But he much blameth me for laying the Case far off, when it is the *London Separation* which he questioneth where the Ministers are no such men. *Answ.* Could any man have so far searcht his heart as to know that he spake only against Separation in this one City? When there is no such Limitation in his Book, And when the same Laws, the same Silencings, Fines, Imprisonments, accusations of the Preachers are all over the Land. But I am glad for the peace of the Nonconformists elsewhere, if it concern not them. 2. As to *London*, he knoweth that I give the Preachers due honour, and that I justify not any unnecessary Separation of the people from them, nor of the Conformists from the Nonconformists. I gave him an account of my own Practice and the Reasons of it: Let other men give account of theirs, I know very many of my mind. 3. And he knoweth that I oft told him that many things make good mens actions culpable in some degree, that make them not criminalls, odious, or to be ruined. And that I gave him many of their Extenuations. 4. Among the rest, verily (to use his own Phrase) it *looks somewhat oddly* by the Church Law or Canon *ipso facto* to excommunicate many score thousands in the Land, meerly for professing to take some things imposed to be sin, and then to revile and prosecute them as Schismatics, for not communicating with you. 5. And I told you that Laws and the higher ground are not always the *Terminus a quo* of *Schism*: Some of them were never of your Flocks, and therefore never separated from you, but as you do from them (and somewhat less.) 6. And the Kings License first, and proclaimed Clemency often, gave them some possession as the Law giveth you. 7.
And

And Plague, Fire and thousands that cannot hear you, made it necessary. But *some Parish Churches are not full.* *Answ.* I see none of those, I come in divers where many cannot hear the Preacher ; and would you have more ? And again I tell you, 1. They keep meetings in lesser Parishes to receive those that come out of greater. 2. If those come to you, they must keep out others. 3. When it is commonly known that in their own great Parishes there is not room, it's hard for Families to look about the City for room in uncertain places. 4. And all persons that culpably dislike you are not therefore to be forsaken.

Seet. 22. But the same man that citeth my Reprehensions of Separation asketh me, *why I do not disown it ;* as if he presently forgot what he had written. I disown Schism, and therefore the greatest in the sinful Church-tearers that smite the Shepherds, and then cry out of the Flocks for being scattered : And I disown the least, but not by Cruelty but in Charity.

Seet. 23. p. 127. He repeats the *Incapacities* named by me, (*viz.* in Knowledge and Utterance, by Heresie, &c.) and saith, *Of all these the people are judges, and so may separate : Thus no settled Church can subsist, &c.*

Answ. 1. It's a hard case that in such a Volumn as this, he will not tell us his own Judgment, further than the accusing of ours intimateth it (which if we tell him of, he can say, [*It was not his sense.*]) Will he openly say that the people have not a private Judgment of discretion in order to their own practice, whether the Preacher be an Heretick, Papist, Infidel, Idolater, or not ? but must take him for their Pastor be he what he will ? I know he will not say it. What then would he be at ? Why doth he accuse us for that which he dare not contradict ? Doth he any where tell us, *in what cases and how far they must judge ?* No, he shuns all such Questions as tend to bring the cause into the light : put twenty and he will answer few or none of them. If he did, perhaps we should be agreed whether he will or not.

But (Reader, bear these tiring Repetitions as I must do) 1. He knoweth that it is the *Ordainers* and not the people whom I make judges who *shall be a Minister.* 2. That it is the King and Patrons that I make the only Judges who shall be tolerated, and maintained by them, and have the Tythes and Temples. 3. And that though the Universal Church was many hundred years, for the peoples Election, I plead *ad esse relationis* for no more as necessary but consent, *who shall be the Pastor,* to whom they will trust the conduct of their Souls : And this is but *Judicium discretionis & privatum non publicum regentis*, only guiding each mans own obedience to God. 4. He knoweth (if he will know) that I say and say again, that the advantages of the Laws and Rulers Favour, and the Tythes.

Tythes and Temples, and Parish Order, and national Association, are so great advantages to the Service of God, that no man should be deprived of them, and go another way, but upon necessity, and very great and urgent cause. But I intend God willing further to prove to him that [*when 9000 Ministers are all required to sin or cease their Ministry, a necessity is put upon them to exercise it against such Prohibitions as farr as they can without doing more hurt than good; And that the sinful compliance of 7000 will not excuse the other 2000 for this duty.*] And this is the case which a friend of truth should have debated.

Seet. 24. p. 126. But (saith he,) How shall a man escape being thought Heretical by the people. Answ. 1. See his own answer here, Chap. 1. 2. How shall one get all the world to be wise and good? If I knew, I cannot procure it. But put the case within your sight? How will you escape being judged no rightful Possessor of your Deanry, or Prebend, or the King's Chaplains place, or the Parish Church of St. Andrews? I know not how: And yet if an Usurper accuse you here, and say e. g. that the Church of St. Andrews is his and not yours, must not the people judge which of you they will take for the Usurper, and which they will joyn with and obey? In the times of Usurpation, many of the people judged the Bishops to be none of their Pastors, nor the ejected Ministers; must not the rest therefore judge that they were? Where Usurpers deny the King's Right, ought not the people to judge him to have right, because they may err? and what Prince or Prelate may not the people judge Usurpers? What Landlord may not the Tenants deny? What Master the Servants? What Husband the Wife? But must they not therefore be discerning Judges, who is their Landlord, Master, Husband, What Schoolmaster may not unlearned men miscensure? What Physician may they not vilifie? And yet they shall judge and choose for themselves, and speed accordingly, who can help it? deny men a judgment of discretion to guide their own choice and actions, and you contradict mankind, and deny men to be men. What in the world is more abused than Reason and Freewill? and yet men must act by Reason and Freewill. It's unworthy a Divine to cry out against a thing for such unavoidable Inconveniencies, as humane darkness and badness do necessitate, and to swallow Camels on the other side and take no notice of the mischiefs thereof, nor once to tell us how to escape both.

Seet. 25. He instanceth in mens censure of me for the Doctrine of Justification and asketh, Are men bound to separate from me? Answ. One would think by many such words that the Doctor did seriously believe that I had said, that all men are bound to follow an erring Judgment, and to separate when they falsely judge they ought. IF

If he think not that I said so, I would not name his fault lest I more offend him : If he think I said so, I had hoped weaker Readers could have better understood me. When I read in the Books of some Conformists yet living whom I much honour, that to obey Conscience though it err is to obey God, I took it for my duty oft and copiously (especially in my Christ Direct.) to open that case, and to prove that *Conscience* is no Law-maker, but only a discernor of Gods Law, and that an erring Conscience involveth a man in sin whether he followeth it or not ; because God changeth not his Law when we change our Judgments of it. But yet there are some cases in which it is a farr greater sin to go against Conscience though it err than with it. The Dr. dare deny none of this. And doth ill if he would perswade men that I deny it : and that God makes it mens duty to do ill whenever they judge it good, or forsake good, when they judge it evil.

Selt. 26. But the great offence is p. 130 that *I insinuate that the whole Body of the Church is guilty of great Faults, Conformity being a scandalous thing with thirty tremendous Aggravations.—And no wonder if men so judging prefer others, &c.* *Ans.* Again and again I say, 1. This is unrighteous dealing ; To impose all those things on us ; To cast us out of the Ministry and Churches for not obeying : To Fine and imprison us, and accuse us as Schismatics and Seditious, To write and preach for the execution of the Laws against us, to our Ruine : To aggravate our Crime because we tell them not our Reasons ; To call us to tell them what we stick at ; To threaten to get the King to force us to give our Reasons ; To declare in Press and Pulpit that we wilfully keep up a Schism and have nothing to say for it ; To continue all this when we have been silent seventeen years, as fearing that they could not bear it ; And after all this when we disavowed any Accusation of them, and only told them what we feared our selves, to come upon us with this charge of *deep accusing their Conformity*, is injustice if there be any in the World. Either it is sin or no sin which we fear. If none, why are we not confuted ? or invited yet to give our proofs ? If sin, who should be most offended ? To be yet plainer with you, had the case been in the times of the old Prophets and Priests, I question whether to let such a Kingdom alone so long in that which we judge to be so great sins, would not have been heavily charged on the Preachers : And I profess that my conscience is more in doubt whether my so long forbearance was not my sin, than whether saying at last what I did was sin : And I had nothing to satisfy it, but the men that I ought to judge wiser than my self, perswaded me that it would have done more hurt than good, and caused but our further rending, And I think

N

the

the Conformists should have been desirous to help them to try whether it were sin or not, and to have been thankful for helping to save them from it, if it proved such. But though hence I extenuate the too great withdrawals of some men against their too deep accusations, he knoweth that notwithstanding all these aggravations, I neither justified nor practised proper Separation.

Seet. 27. p. 133. The next charge is that I make them Usurpers, viz, 1. *All that come into the place of the ejected Ministers, at least to the people that consent not : But Law and Usurpation are contrary.* *Answ.* 1. I never said that all are Usurpers to all the people that consent not : If the body of the Church consent the man is no Usurper, though some odd persons consent not. He is the Churches Pastor, though not the refusers. 2. I never said that any that had the Law for them, were Usurpers of the Tithes and Temples. 3. I never said that all that succeed ejected Ministers are Usurpers ; many of them have the Churches after-consent, though not their Election. Yea I often said, 1. That it is the peoples duty to consent to the change when it is for the Churches good. 2. And that their constant Communion signifieth their consent. But I will not believe yet that the *Law* will prove a man no Usurper of the Pastoral Relation. And when I have so largely proved the contrary to be true, and to be the judgment of the ancient Churches, it's an unsatisfactory course to me, to leave it unanswered, and suppose himself in the right. Not only the first 300 years, but even under *Constantinus, Valens, Theodosius Junior, Zeno, Basiliscus, Anastatinus, Philippicus, Justinian, &c.* even the Patriarchal Seats practised the contrary, keeping their chosen Pastors and refusing those imposed by the Emperors ; and other Bishops Seates the Emperors seldom meddled with as to the choice. Yea in *Arcadius's* days *Chrysostomes Joannites*, in his imperial City were of another mind. Is his *Rule true* only in *England*, or in *France, Spain, Italy, Muscovy, &c.* also, or where, that the *Law* maketh men true Pastors?

Seet. 28. But p. 132. he said [that he detesteth the Principles that set mans Laws above Gods, and that in stating the Controversie he supposed an Agreement in all the Substantials of Religion between the dissenting parties of our Church. *Answ.* Of all things you are the unhappiest in stating the Controversie. The Instances here were 1. Insufficiency through Ignorance, 2. Heresie, 3. Malignant oppugning the very ends of the Ministry, 4. No true calling. 1. Doth he agree with us in all the Substantials of Religion who knoweth not the very essentials of Christianity ? *Ignorantis non est Consensus.* 2. Doth he agree with us in all the substantials that is a Heretick ? or if we falsely judge his opinion Heresie, do we agree with him ?

3. Is malignant opposing Godliness and pleading for prophaneness or ungodliness an agreement in all the Substantials? 4. What if we agree in all Substantials with an unordained Layman imposed on us? is he therefore our true Pastor? 5. But how shall we know whether we agree or not, if we are no judges of it? Do you not see your own Contradictions? who shall judge whether the Pastors or People agree? shall the Prince or Patron? If you know the Teachers heart, how know you the Peoples? Must we believe that we agree, because you say so? If the people must judge whether they *Agree*, they must judge of the things in which the *Agreement* is, that is, both the *Pastors Doctrine* and their own minds. And is not this to judge whether he be a Heretick, &c. or not? And who shall judge whether the disagreement be in *Substantials*? It must be the agreeers. And they must be wiser than I if they can learn from you here, what is a *Substantial*, and how to know it.

Sett. 29. It may be he will say, that *where Princes and Parliaments are Orthodox, none are Usurpers, but true Pastors whom they impose.* *Ans.* But doth not *this* make the people Judges whether *Princes and Parliaments are Orthodox*, and is not that as dangerous as to judge of the Teachers? And Orthodox Princes and Parliaments may impose Heretical Teachers: and may by Law enable Patrons and Prelates to impose them. What more natural than to propagate what men like, and oppose what they hate? If the many hundred Patrons in *England* be all orthodox and pious, and free from Schism, &c. we are strangely happy: If not we may expect that they choose accordingly. *But the Bishops will secure us.* *Ans.* 1. They have not done. 2. They say *they cannot by Law.* 3. Would it be any wonder if Bishop Goodman of *Glocester* kept not out any Popish Teacher? Or if such Fathers of the Church as Archbishop Bromhall let in such as would have the *Pope Govern us all by the Canons* as Patriark and *principium unitatis*, and all pass for Schismatics that consent not to such a forreign Jurisdiction, contrary to our National Oaths.

Sett. 30. As to his instance of *Solomons* putting out *Abiathar*, &c. I answered it fully (and many more objections) in my first *Plea*, and will not write the same again for him that thinks it not worth the answering or taking notice of.

Sett. 31. When p. 138, 139. he makes it the way to all imaginable *Confusions*, to deny, 1. that the *Kings Nomination of Bishops*. 2. and the *Patrons of Parish Pastors* proveth them no Usurpers, but true Pastors, is he not an unreverend dishonourer of Bishops himself, who maketh them all that for a thousand years held the same that I do, to be the authors of all imaginable *Confusion*? Is he not unreverend to their Canons? and to antiqui-

ty? and to the universal Church it self? Whatever in his third part he Cavils against it, he cannot be so strange to Church-history as not to know that they were commonly against him.

Sect. 32. The matter of the next accusation is p. 139, 140. having said *Plea p. 41. 42.* [*If any make sinful terms of Communion by Laws or Mandate, imposing things forbidden by God on those that will have Communion, and expelling those that will not so sin*] I add [*If any should not only excommunicate such persons for not complying with them in sin, but also persecute them with Malice, Imprisonments, Banishment or other Persecution to force them to transgress, this were heinous aggravated Schism.*] *Ans.* And is not this true? or doth his bare repeating it disprove it? Is he a zealous Enemy of Schism that taketh all this for none? I did not steal it out of his defence of Archbishop Laud, but less than this is there made Schism. Yet he tells us that he *sets not mans Laws above Gods*, nor *pleads for Persecution*. But lest the repeating of my words should shame the Accuser he hath two handsome devices 1. He puts [*complying with them in sin, that is, Conformity,*] as refused, instead of [*those that will not so sin, in sinful terms of Communion forbidden by God, &c.*] 2. He forgeth an addition as mine [*and therefore it is no sin to separate from such*] when I have no such words, being only there telling what is Schism, and not *what is not*. I confess it will sound oddly to say [*It is Schism not to communicate with those who excommunicate, imprison and banish me by Law, if I will not do that which God forbids, and they make a Condition of my communion.*] For I must not sin: And in prison and Banishment under Excommunication they deny me communion. And yet I say not that it's always faultless, For if they do not execute their own Law, in some cases, where publick good requireth it, I may best communicate with them as far as they permit me without the imposed sin, till they do execute them. But this excuseth not their Schism.

Sect. 33. p. 140. He blames me as charging him with the silencing design. *Ans.* I did warn him in real desire of his safety: If defending the *Church-Laws and Endeavours* for our restraint, in the words to which I refer the Reader: If preaching and writing against our preaching as Schism, and all the rest in his Books do signifie no owning of our silencing, I am glad that he meaneth better than he seemeth: who could have thought otherwise that had read 1. his first Q. whether it be not in the power of those that give orders to limit and suspend the exercise of the ministerial Function. Q. 2. And whether the Christian Magistrate may not justly restrain such Ministers from preaching, who after the experience, do refuse to renounce those Principles which they judge do naturally tend to involve us again in the like trouble. And *Serm. p. 42. the Church of Englands endeavours after Uniformity*

Uniformity is acquitted from Tyranny over the Consciences of men, by the Judgment, &c.] And p. 54. condemning them as *hard thoughts of the Bishops that in cruelty they follow Ithacius, &c.* And in this new Book, more such might have deceived a man that judged by his words. And his arguing that it is unlawful to preach to them because it is unlawful to hear; What was the meaning of all this if not silencing us?

Sett. 34. p. 140. The next Crime is [*Plea p. 42. As long as they suppose the terms of our Communion to be sinful, they say, The Schism doth not lie on those that separate, but on those that do impose such terms: and therefore they may lawfully separate from such imposers.*] *Ans.* It's hard to know what words to use to detect all these historical untruths without being thought passionate. 1. I never said that (*supposing them sinful*) will justify a false supposer, but have oft said the clean contrary (*their supposing*) is of his forging. 2. I said not (*the Schism doth not lie on those that separate*) but only that it's *Schism in the Imposers.*) This also is his Fiction. 3. And I said not (*and therefore they may lawfully separate from such imposers.*) But all Readers will not stay to find out his Forgeries. But how much of this he said once himself, see in my Chap. 1.

Sett. 49. But here he comes to some closing distinction, which should have gone before; [*Between terms of Communion plainly and in themselves sinful; and such as are only fancied to be so through prejudice or wilful ignorance, or error of conscience.*] *Ans.* What a deal of labour might he have spared himself and us, if he had here fixed the Controversie in the beginning; we thankfully accept your late distinction: we ever desired here to put it to the Issue; If it be through *prejudice wilful Ignorance or Error* that we judge Conformity a sin, not only Separation but *Nonconformity is a sin.* If we do not prove some parts of Conformity (for one is enough) to be *plainly sinful*, which are imposed as Conditions of our Ministerial Communion, and somewhat imposed on the people as conditions of all that part of your Communion, which I ever dissuaded them from, let the blame be ours:

Sett. 35. He passeth next to them that *deal more ingenuously than I in owning Separation.* And then returneth to me p. 151. and he over and over repeateth his false accusation, [*that I think it lawful to communicate with them occasionally, but not as Churches (as thinking they want an essential part, viz. a Pastor with Episcopal Power) but as Oratories, and so that I renounce Communion with their Churches as Churches.*] *Answ.* If these untruths had been made without evidence only, and not also against evidence, they had been the more excusable in a man of consideration: But now they are not so, when I have so often declared that I take the Parish Churches that have true Pastors for true governed Churches, and prove that they have true Bishops (*Episcopos Gregis*) whether the Diocefans will or not, because Gods Will and

and not the Investors, instituteth their Office, and measureth their power, and the people shew their consent by constant Communion.

Self. 36. Then because [*I never gathered a Church, nor baptized any in 20 years, nor gave the Sacrament in 18,*] he would know [*what Church I have been of all this time,*] and he supposeth [*of no Church.*] *Ans.* I thought he had done with this before : but he thinks it an advantage not to be so easily let go. Would he know. 1. What my *Thoughts* were ? 2. Or my *Church-Covenant* ? 3. Or my *actual Communion* ? He shall know all. 1. I thought divers Ministers where I lived true Pastors, and the Churches true Churches : I cannot say so of every Curate. 2. I made no Covenant with any of them : If I had Mr. *Cheny* would have condemned me of Atheism, Infidelity, and what not. 3. With divers of them I went constantly to the Liturgy, Sermon and Sacrament, as with true Churches, with some of them I only joyned in prayer and hearing, I heard Dr. *Rieves* till he caused me to be sent to Jail, and then I could not : And though I was accused by many for hearing a swearer, I told them, he swore not in the Pulpit : I heard his poor Curate constantly, when I was accused for hearing a Drunkard, and told them that he was not drunk in the Pulpit. But I must tell you, I communicated also with some Nonconformists. And now account me of a Church or no Church as you please. I doubt you are renewing the Independent Questions with me, which I am loth to dispute. 1. *Qu.* Whether an ordained Minister must be a private Member of another mans Church ? *Q. 2.* Whether when a Non-resident Dean leaveth his Parish to an ignorant drunken Curate, the Parish Church be essentiated by its relation to the Resident Curate, or the Non-resident Dean ? *Q. 3.* Whether a Minister not degraded but silenced, living in such a Parish is bound to take that Curate for one that hath the Pastoral Charge of his Soul, and as the rest of the flock to commit his Soul to his Pastoral Conduct in personal, private and publick Offices ? 4. But I would ask the Dean himself, whether a man may not be a fixed Member of two or three Churches at once ? The Reasons of the *Quere*, are 1. Because (by them) a man may be the fixed *Pastor* of two or three Parish Churches at once : And an Integral Member of many is not so hard a case, as to be a constitutive Regent Part of many. 2. Because a man may have two houses in two Parishes at once ; As many Londoners have half their Family at a near Country house, and half at a City house, and are themselves part of the week or day at one, and part at the other. And they make Covenants with neither, but what *actual Communion* intimateth. *Q. 5.* And if so why might not I at once be judged a Member of two Churches at once, so far as I communicate oft with both ? I therefore answer his question further,

further, *what Church I was a Member of ?* 1. I was a Member of Christs Universal Church ? Is that none ? and yet is in the Creed ? 2. I was a Member of the reformed Church if you will call that *One* because associated in one Reformed Religion. 3. I was a Member of the Church of *England*, both as a Christian Kingdom, and as the Churches in *England* agreeing in the Christian Reformed Religion. 4. I was a Member of the Provincial Church of *Canterbury*, so far as living peaceably in it, and submitting both to such power as they had from the King as Magistrates and a meer general helping instructing care of many Churches could make me. 5. So far also I was a Member of the Diocesan Churches where I lived. 6. And I was a Member of some Parochial Churches so far as constant Communion could make or prove me : And of others (two at once) so far as partial and moveable Communion could prove me. If this will not satisfie you, I have proved before (and oft to some Independants) that many men are under no obligation to be fixed Members of any Parish Church : (whether the King be of any I know not.)

*Señt. 37. But p. 152. he comes upon me, why I thought it not my duty all this while to Baptize, Administer the Sacrament, was I not solemnly bound by Ordination to one as well as the other ? Presbyters of old were rarely allowed to preach.] Ans. 1. You tell the World what measure we must expect from such as you. If we had all forborn any Church gatherings, and Pastoral undertaking of Flocks, and both Sacraments, &c. and only preached as loth to offend you more than needs, our accusations had but been the greater ? which encourageth your more ingenious Dissenters to do what they also are accused of. 2. Do you not know our Reasons ? They are these : 1. Because we suppose there is a greater want of our preaching, than of our administering Sacraments : And we would obey the Laws in all things lawful ; and go from you and offend you no further than necessity will justify us. 2. Because a Ministers Relation to the Church-Universal and to the world ceaseth not, when his relation to a Parish Church may cease. And we have not the same obligations to give the Sacrament to all the Christians or World where we preach, as we have in a Parish Charge. *Paul* thanketh God that he baptized not many Corinthians, because he was not sent to baptize but to preach the Gospel ; nor is the terrible charge 2 *Tim. 4. 12.* equal as to both. 3. Our Ordination bound us to preach and administer Sacraments, when we are thereto lawfully called : And we were so called to one, when we were not to the other : nor were all of us so called alike. But when we know that this way doth as much offend you, we may go further in due time. And do you in one part of your Book blame us for going further than the old Nonconformists (as you*

you thought) and in the second thus accuse us for not going further.

Seet. 38. He is again at his talk of only *occasional Communion*? And had his mistake no *Occasion*? yes; he that readeth my Books may see what: that is, 1. When I have said that some Parishes having not capable or called Pastors I take to be no true Political Churches; but yet can communicate with such as Oratories or Chappels. 2. That some true Churches I communicate with in *transitu* or occasionally as strangers, whose Discipline and Ministers Calling I am not bound to take account of. 3. I tell those that withdraw too far and take some true Churches for none, that were it so they might occasionally join with them as Oratories, 4. And those that dare not commit their Souls to the Pastoral Conduct of some weak and bad men, that yet they may occasionally communicate with them upon great and urgent Reasons. And here he gathereth his oft repeated untrue Reports.

Seet. 39. p. 156. He grants there is no Separation *where there is no Obligation*. And he will prove us obliged to *constant Communion* with them. 1. *Because we must use all lawful means for Peace and Unity.* *Ans.* 1. We are ready to prove that our *Conformity*, nor our *forbearing to preach the Gospel* are no lawful means. 2. Can you as well prove, 1. That it is not lawful for you to joyn with us? 2. And to forbear silencing, excommunicating, fining and imprisoning us? Was it no lawful means for *Peace and Unity* to have forborn imposing all the Covenants, Professions, Subscriptions, Oaths and Practises, of what you call indifferent and we think sinful? 3. And is it not lawful for Parents to enter their own Children at Baptism in Covenant with God? 4. Is it unlawful to Christen such as scruple your use of the Cross? 5. Or to receive those to Communion that scruple your Gesture? 6. Or to forbear Canonical Excommunicating all professed Nonconformists in the Land? 7. Or to let Lords and Gentlemen choose any Nonconformists to be Tutors to their Children, whilst the Papists may send theirs to *Doway, St. Omers, &c.* He saith, he is [*perswaded it is one of the provoking sins of the Nonconformists, that they have been so backward to do, what they were convinced they might with a good conscience.* *Ans.* Woe to us, if we be not willing to know our sins. But 1. If you will tell me of any one lawful thing that I have omitted, that tended to Peace, I will thank you. 2. An indifferent thing is no means of Peace when it will do more hurt than good. To cease the Ministry we durst not: To use some indifferent forms in your Churches we could not, being cast and kept out. And to use the same to those that are against them; when it will hurt them, and procure no peace with you, and those have sped worst from you that have come nearest you, and nothing will serve but all; what tendency

dency hath this to Unity ? You know my own case proveth all this. I regarded not the censures of any that go too far, so as to keep me from doing what I judged lawful : And did it tend to peace ? No, one sends me to Jail when I went twice a day to his Church : Others say, *He is like an Ape, that is so much the more ugly because he is like a man* : Another more sober saith, *[I know not what to make of Mr. B. He communicateth with us, and he preacheth to the Nonconformists : Like a man that will go one step on one side the hedge, and another step on the other.]* And this man is much in the right : for I say still, *[It is the separating hedges in Christ's Vineyard that I hate, and the enclosing hedge that I am for : I have Business, Friends, Relations and great Duties on both sides the hedge, some with you and some with others ; And if your hedges would separate Parents from Children, Husband and Wife, Christian Neighbours, &c. causelessly I will not be so separated, but do my best to pull down that hedge. And again consider whose sin it is, that so many lawful things are denied us for Unity. Hold but to your Rule here and we are agreed. And he seemeth to consent. For,*

Sect. 40. p. 176. Of the Rule Phil. 3. 16. he saith, [If I will but allow that by virtue of that Rule men are bound to do all things lawful for the preserving the peace of the Church, we have no further difference about this matter. Ans.] It's well he will say so much of the Rule, we gladly consent. Then all the question is, what's lawful on both sides ? I add one Q. more. Is it not lawful for peace to forbear forcing men to disoblige 1000 ? whom they never knew, from being obliged by an Oath and Vow to that part of the matter which is good ? If it be the conjunction of some things bad, that disobligeth them, then he that inserteth a bad thing is free from all obligations of his vow, even in *materia licita & necessaria*. And if the want of *imposing Power* be made the cause, whether is the Coronation Oath imposed by a superior Power on the King, or is it his own contract ? or is he therefore not obliged by it ? Had it not been requisite that you should have justified all that we stick at as unlawful, before you charge us with crossing this Rule ?

Sect. 56. p. 204, &c. My words in many Books against Schism are cited and praised ; Reader, he tells men the measure of their Charity and Church Communion, *viz.* That men that do as much as I do, that forbore so long Sacramental Administration, that gathered no Church, that held constant Communion with divers Parish Churches, that have wrote so much and earnestly against Schism, shall yet be ejected, silenced, pay 40 l. a Sermon and lie in Jails unless I will do more. While Bishop *Lauds* design for widening the Church door to the Papists, is magnified by *Heylin* and others as a good work.

Selt. 13. First he finds but *two* justifiable Causes of Separation ; but p. 213, 214. he hath found *three and no more*. 1. *Idolatrous Worship* : 2. *False Doctrine imposed instead of true*. 3. *Making and imposing things indifferent as necessary to Salvation*. *Ans.* 1. Readers, do you remember how even now he exposed to *odium*, the peoples judging whether the Pastors be Here-ticks ? And now they may separate for false Doctrine. 2. I intreat him to think again of these Cases following. 1. What if the Worship be not Idolatrous, but Blasphemous, or utterly Ridiculous, tending to contempt of God ? 2. What if it be in an unknown Tongue ? 3. What if the Church have no true Minister ? I am glad you are not for separating for want of Episcopacy or Episcopal Ordination ? 4. What if the Church want half the Church-Worship ? as to have Preaching and Prayer without Sacraments ? or Sacraments without Preaching or Prayer, or Preaching without Prayer, &c. 5. What if the Church be but schismatical ? Have you written all this Book, to draw men to you from the Independant Churches, and do you now tell us that the people may not separate from them, on the account of Schism ? 6. What if a Church require me to tell or subscribe to one known Lie, or to say, that I believe what I do not : or to justify thousands that I think obliged by a Vow, if they break it ? What if they impose any one sin on me without which they will not receive me to Communion ? 7. What if I remove for my Edification from a drunken ignorant Priest, to the Church of a wise and holy Pastor ? 8. Are we looser than Pope *Nicholas* that forbad men to hear Mass from a Fornicating Priest ? 9. I would you had spoken to Edification and told men what *false Doctrine it is that will allow Separation*, and whether it's *false Doctrine preached*, or only *imposed* on the person to be owned ? If the former, is it *all false Doctrine* or but *some*, and what ? Verily, if all, you are tenfold more a Separatist than I : For I look to hear sometimes some words of false Doctrine in most Pulpits, even of Conformists ? If it must be heresie it self, I will not separate for once hearing it, if the Church profess it not. If it be *imposed Error* that you mean, take heed lest you justify Separation from your Church, by the new Article of Infants certain Salvation. And when both Arminians and Anti-Arminians subscribe the 39 Articles, tell us whether those Articles are true in both their senses, or whether the sence be not the thing subscribed ? or whether one half of them should separate. You are too unmerciful to your self ; but what kind of Churches should there be upon your terms ? I find no more in his second part which I am much concerned in.

C H A P. VII.

The Reply to his Third Part : The beginning.

Sect. 1. **I**N his third Part I first find my self accused p. 242, &c. And that is not only by insisting on a false accusation of my words, but adding a confutation of himself, as if he discerned not that he did it. In *Treat. of Concord* I say, [*If it holdeth that God instituted only Congregational or Parochial Churches, as for present Communion, then none of the rest instituted by man may deprive them of their priviledges granted by Christ.*] I put it but with an (*If it be so*) because I told them my own doubt of it. After I say, [*To devise new species of Churches without Gods Authority, and impose them on the World; yea in his name, and call all Dissenters Schismatics, is worse Usurpation than to make and impose new Ceremonies and Liturgies.*] And can any Christian deny either of these? But he saith, [*This supposeth Congregational Churches to be so much the institution of Christ, that any constitution above these is unlawful and unsupportable :*] which is more than the *Independant Brethren* do assert. And is any word of all this true? 1. The *Independants* much insist on this? I refer him now but to *Amesii Medul. de Eccl. Minist.* 2. Do the words suppose that which is plainly excepted in them? If it were granted. 1. That the Congregational only are so instituted. 2. And that others are not set over them by God, 3. And yet are obtruded in his name, without his authority. 4. And all Dissenters called Schismatics,] then I say they are unlawful. 5. To confute himself plainly he confelleth that I say, *The question is not whether the Archbishops should be over the particular Churches, as Successors to the Apostolical and General Overseers of the first Age in the ordinary continued parts of their Office. Nor whether Patriarks, Diocefans, Lay-Chancellors as Officers of the King, exercising Magistracy be lawful.*] And yet he saith that I suppose the contrary. He next pretends to give my Reasons : And the chief is, *because it overthroweth the species of Gods making;* when I only say, *That which overthroweth it is unlawful;* which is not the Archbishops that are over the lower Bishops, but those that put them all down, and governed the Carkasses of the mortified particular Churches as the lowest Bishops of many score or hundred such as themselves. And he saith I am for the *full exercise of Discipline within the particular Church;* while he confess I spake not against Archbishops. And yet he saith, *This is a fair representation of my opinion.*

Señt. 2. Coming to prove our Episcopacy the same with the Primitive he pretendeth to confute me : That which I asserted was, 1. That by the first Institution, and Constitution, every Church no bigger for number of Souls than one of our great Parishes had a Bishop of their own, (one or more I disputed not.) 2. Yea that for the first two hundred years if not more, no one Bishop had a Church so big as some of our Parishes, at least except *Alexandria* and *Rome*, and even of them it is not certain that they had more Souls. 3. That after by degrees the case was altered : But yet after there were many *Meetings* like Chappels, a while there was but one Altar. 4. After that those Chappels had Altars ; but so as that at certain times of the year, the people of the Cities and next parts were all to communicate with the Bishop, and were no more than could meet to choose the Bishops, and to be present as to the main body of them, and disciplinary debates, to give consent. 5. In *Cyprian's* time at *Carthage* (a place of greatness and great numbers of Christians) the Church was grown very great, but not beyond the exercise of such personal Communion as I described : And the Bishops there and round about being worthy men, kept up the life of the former Discipline. And as great as their Church was, we would be glad of such an Episcopacy, Order and Communion. For I oft told you, that by *present Communion*, I meant not that all must meet in one place at once, (For the tenth part of some Parishes cannot :) But that as Neighbours and Citizens, may have personal Converse and Meetings *per vices*, of some at one time and some at another, as different from meer mental Communion, or by Synods or Persons delegate, or as their Governours or Representatives, and this for mutual Edification in holy Doctrine, Worship and Conversation. And that the footsteps of this remained long, when worldly Reasons had made a change.

And all this I have proved so fully in my Treatise of Episcopacy besides what's said in my Abstract of the Episcopal History, that till some man shall confute the full Evidence of Antiquity there brought, I have no more in Reason to do upon that subject. And though the Doctors History of this be the most considerable part of all his Book, yet so far doth he leave what I say uncontradicted, that I find not one word that he saith against any of my Testimonies, nor any for his own cause, for the first two hundred years : But when he should have proved the extent of the Churches at two hundred years, he begins his historical Proofs at two hundred and fifty for three or four great Cities in the World, and so proceeds to *Augustine* at above four hundred, and *Victor Uticensis* about four hundred and ninety, *Theodoret* four hundred and thirty, (where he

he supposeth me to say that of his City, which I said of the Diocess of that City :) And to confute all Impertinencies, and groundless Suppositions, while my full proofs are unanswered, is but loss of time.

Seçt. 3. His chief argument is, [*that no City how great soever was to have more Bishops than one.*] *Ans. 1.* He can prove no such Rule in the first two hundred years. *2.* See how well the defenders of Prelacy agree ? *Grotius* (& *de Imperio* & in *Anotat.*) and *Dr. Hammond* I cited, who say that Cities at first had two Bishops in-each (*Rome, Antioch, &c.*) one of Jewish Christians, and one of Gentile Christians, and saith *D. H. Peter at Rome* was Bishop of the *Jews*, and *Paul* of the *Gentiles*, and they had two Successors ; and saith *Grotius* The Churches were formed to the manner of the *Synagogues*, and there were divers Churches with divers Bishops in the same City (in *1 Tim. 5. 17.* & *de Imp. p. 355, 356, 357.*) *3.* In the fourth Century a Council at *Capua* decreed that the two Bishops with their several Churches at *Antioch* (*Flavian's* and *Evagrius*) should live together in Love and Peace. *4.* This was a good custom while there were in the Cities no more than one Bishop might take care of : And the custom held when times altered the case and reason of it : And Possession and the Desire to avoid division made it held up by good men. *5.* I have at large in my Treatise of Episcopacy confuted the opinion of appropriating Bishops to Cities ; and so did the old Churches that set up *Chorepiscopos*.

Seçt. 4. p. 259. He saith, [*In Cities and Dioceses under one Bishop were several distinct Congregations and Altars.*] *Ans. 1.* Yes, no doubt, after the second Century, and perhaps in two Cities a little before ; but in few in the World till towards the fourth Century. *2.* This is the same man who in the very Sermon which he defendeth said [*p. 27. Though when the Churches increased the occasional Meetings were frequent in several places, yet still there was but one Church, and one Altar, and one Baptism, and one Bishop, with many Presbyters assisting him : And this is so very plain in Antiquity, as to the Churches planted by the Apostles themselves in several parts, that none but a stranger to the history of the Church can ever call it in question.*] But when I told him how this would agree us, and hurt his cause, he will quickly fall under his own censure, and became [*a stranger to the history of the Church*] asserting many Altars in one Church of one Bishop. This Sermon was written since his *Irenicon*. And now he feigneth a distinction between [*An Altar taken with particular respect to a Bishop : and for the place at which Christians did communicate.*] But what was the Altar that was taken with particular respect to the Bishop ? Was it not the material place of Communion ? And so the members of the distinction are co-incident. Saith *Optatus lib. 6. Quid est Altare nisi sedes & corporis & sanguinis Christi ?* Each Church

Church had long but one of these. The best Altars that were made after the chief Church Altars were not for ordinary communion, but honorary of some Martyrs. The truth is, the phrase of *unum Altare* was taken up when each Church had but one; but to set up *Altare contra Alta:e* continued after to signifie *Anti-Churches*. But I have fully answered this in my *Treatise of Episcopacy*. His conjectures from the numbers of Officers, &c. he may see there also sufficiently confuted and in *Cb. Hist.* And the odd instance of *Theodoret* he doth not at all make credible by his willing belief of *Metius* and other Popish Feigners. And were that Epistle genuine a Cypher is easily dropt in by Corrupters: It hath need of better authority that shall be so singular from the case of all other Churches. And I suppose he knoweth that *Cyrus* was not a simple Bishoprick, but a Metropolitane Seat, and might have 800 Parish Bishops.

Yea whereas there were under *Antioch* seven Dioceses, and fifteen Provinces or as others say thirteen, that yet had many Bishops under them, as *Seleucia* twenty four. &c. that were more dependant on *Antioch*, *Cyrus* was one of the eight Provinces or *Metropolis* that were *per se subsistentes*: And therefore when *Theodoret* said how many Churches were under hands, it's like he meant Bishops Churches and not meer Presbyters, and either a Cypher dropt in corrupted the account (or else the Bishops had but single Congregations; But for my part as the case so late concerneth me not, so I see nothing to perswade me that that Epistle is genuine and uncorrupt. But I would not have a Diocess which then had many Provinces, or a Province which had many Bishops Churches, be taken for a single Church.

Sect. 5. The same I say of *Carthage*, which was the *Metropolis* of *Africa*, and the first of six Provinces before *Justinian*, and of seven after, and Proconsular, and the Church called *Africa Caput* as *August. ep. 162*. The sixth and seventh *Carthage* Councils tell us of the distribution of the Provinces, decreeing three Judges to be sent out of each Province, *viz. Carthage, Numidia, Byzacena, Mauritania, &c.* Yea *Leo 9. P. in Epist. ad Thom. &c.* saith that the Bishop of *Carthage* was *post Pont. Rom. primus Archiepiscopus & totius Africa maximus Metropolitanus*, (Though yet *Binnius* truly say that in *Cyprian's* time he was not an Archbishop, that is, no proper Governor of Bishops, because they concluded in Council, *nemo nostrum dicitur Episcopus Episcoporum*; but he was the chief of that great Province. And the Dr. himself out of *Victor* mentioneth one *Cressens* that had one hundred and twenty Bishops under him: He was Metropolitane of *Aquitana* and a Diocess then having many Provinces; how many be in a Diocess *Victor* there tells you that the Bishop of *Carthage* in his own Eugitane Province had one hundred sixty four Bishops. And how great were their Churches then?

and

and *L. 2.* when he lamenteth the great number of their banished, Bishops, Presbyters and the Church-members were 4976. And one Parish here hath 40000 if not more. He that considereth that *Cyrus* was at most but 60 miles from *Antioch* the Patriarchal Seat, and that a *Carthage* Council had sometimes 600 Bishops, and the Donatists perhaps had as many; and that as he saith, *Cresceus* had one hundred and twenty Bishops under him, and that *Cyprian* so often tells us how Bishops were chosen by all the People, and how he managed his Discipline in the presence of all his *Plebs*, (Laity) and by their consent; and how he telleth that it was the peoples duty to separate from the communion of a sinning Bishop (which implieth communion before) and how the Bishops in Council put the question, When a Church wanted a Bishop, whether one of them that was a Bishop and had perhaps but one or two or three Presbyters was bound to part with one to that wanting Church to make a Bishop of? and considereth the circuit and distance of their Cities, and much more which I have elsewhere named, may well believe large Provinces, and larger Diocesses, but will think of their Bishops Churches as we must do of theirs in *Ireland*, when a late converted Countrey had six hundred Bishops. Make but Christs true discipline practicable, and tie us not to swear or assent to your uncertain forms and we should no further trouble you in this.

Sett. 6. As for the credit he giveth to *Syrmondus's* copy of *Theodore's* Epistle, or to the later Editions of his Works, I am not bound to be as credulous, nor to take the last Editions for the best, when they come out of the Jesuits hands: And can prove the Epistle to *Joh. Antioch*, which *Bellarmino* would disprove, to be more credible than this: And it's one blot that he saith *Theodore's* Epist. 6. mentioneth the Metropolitane he was under, when he was under none, but was himself an Independant Metropolitane: For so the *Notitia Episc.* tells us, was *Berytus, Heliopolis, Laodicea, Samasata, Cyros, Pompriopolis, Mopsuestia* and *Adama*. If his Province was as the Epistle cited saith *fourty Miles square*, and the Christians so numerous as is said, and he name none of the Bishops under him, but number the Churches, it's like they were Episcopal Churches and very small. And that *Villages had Churches* it's no wonder when there were many *Chorepiscopi* not only under the Metropolitanes but the City Bishops. And why I must reject his long received Work if I question his late found Epistles I know not. But again I say, this is nothing to our cause, being so long after the ages I mentioned, & my contrary evidence being not at all confuted.

His confidence p. 260, 261. about some citations out of *Theodore*, runs upon false Insinuations: 1. That the question is not of the number of Churches, but about the extent of the Episcopal Power, whether it was limited.

limited to one Parochial Church, or extended over many : when he knoweth that I had no such question ; but whether those whose power was over many Churches in the first two Centuries at least, had not as many Bishops under them over those Churches (if such there were.) Or if the Bishops were of the lowest rank, whether those under were not then denyyed to be Churches for want of Bishops, and were not only parts of a Church ? 2. And he feigneth me to bring *Theodorets* Testimonies to prove that even then in *Alex.* and *Antioch* a Church was but one Congregation, when I brought it only to prove, that even in that age they were so small, that the footsteps of the ancient shape of them still appeared. Such Fictions may deceive them that will not try what is said, but only read the answerer. But by this citation I see he read my Treatise of *E-pisc.* before his Book came out. And therefore I will pass by these nibblings till he answer it.

Sett. 7. p. 262. He accuseth me of [*Rage and Bitterness*] for saying that [*if he will plead for so much Presumption, Profanation of Gods name, Usurpation, Uncharitableness and Schism, as to own their Churches to be new, and devised without Gods Authority, and yet may in his name be imposed on the World, and all Dissenters called Schismaticks,*] I leave him. And first he feigneth that I charge him with this, which is untrue, unless he will charge himself with it. But why do I put in [*If you will so plead.*] *Ans.* Because he accused me for saying the contrary, viz. [*that so to divide, and so to impose, is worse, &c.* But because I know not why he accused so plain a truth, I said [*If you do so.*] But he now tells me that he (*quoted it to shew that I looked on all Churches beyond Parochial, as Churches meerly of mans devising,*) which is another untruth confessed by himself, who before had this up and cited my own words to the contrary ; viz. that I believe the Catholick Church and deny not National associated Churches ; nor Archbishops that put not down the particular Churches, Pastors and Discipline : one mistake is his excuse for another. Had he meant as aforesaid, had my words been *Rage*, or necessary confutation ?

Sett. 8. Yea it is his business in the very next page 263 to confute his own accusation of me by citing my own concessions. And p. 264. he giveth me leave to call our Bishops Archbishops. *Ans.* But 1. Archbishops have Churches with their proper Bishops under them. But our Bishops say that there are no such under them. 2. I told you before that as the Major General, Quartermaster General, &c. of an Army constituteth not a distinct body from the Army and the particular Regiments and Troops, so I am not certain that Apostles or Evangelists or any general Preachers as such, did constitute any Church Form distinct from the Catholick

Catholick and the particular Bishops Churches : But if they are supposed to have taken their several fixed Provinces (which I never saw proved) I will not contend whether those Provinces may be called Churches. If we agree about the thing, use the name as you see cause.

Se^{ct}. 9. And to your talk of our Bishops being of the same sort, I ask you whether any of the Bishops for 300 years, or for long after save *Cyril Alexand.* by violence, did ever use or claim any power over any Ministers or Christians, besides meer fatherly Teaching, Perswading, urging Gods Word on them, and applying it to the consciences of particular Persons by Admonitions, verbal Censures and Absolutions? Did they meddle by Force, with Body or Purse? Let your Bishops use no other force or way of constraint than the Apostles did, (if they be their Successors) and not lay the excommunicate in Prisons and ruine their Bodies and Estates, & *valeat quantum valere potest.* But Mr. *Glanville* and many of you tell us, how little you care for it without the Sword.

Se^{ct}. 10. If any man will but consider what I cited out of *Greg. Nazianzen* that saith Men unfit were so ambitious to be of the Clergy, that the Clergy was in many Churches almost as many as the Laity; And that Presbyters then were much like the Presbyterians Elders, save that they had the power of Word and Sacraments though they seldom exercised Preaching in Cities, but left that to the Bishop; and that the number of their *Acoluthi, Exorcista, Ostiarii, Lectores, Subdiaconi, Diaconi, &c.* made up the great body of them. And the very Boys and Schollars that were bred up under them, yea or but for Church-singing, are sometimes joynd to make up the number, see *Isidor. de Offic. Eccl. L. 2.* even all the Monks, are often numbred with them. And *Victor* cited by him seemeth to number twice the *Infantuli* so bred up with the great number of Readers, to the *Carthage* Clergy, I say he that considers all this, will not judge of the number of people or Churches by the number of the Clergy, as he would do now with us, where the great Parishes have but two or three Priests.

Se^{ct}. 11. And as to the cause that I plead for, it is enough that I have proved that even when the name of Bishop was confined to the *Episcopi Pastorum*, yet the Presbyters had the power of the Keys, and were *Episcopi Gregis*, and exercised this power in their distant Countrey assemblies, though under the Bishop, and the Bishop was to exercise his with them as Assistants; so that the particular Churches were not really unchurched.

Se^{ct}. 12. p. 265. He cometh nearer our controversie, but first fallily stateth the question, supposing that I say that (the whole power of the Pres-
P byters

byters is swallowed up by the Bishops.) And is the disputing of a question falsely stated of any profit? I only said that the office of a Church-Pastor or Presbyter hath three essential parts, *viz.* the power of Teaching the Church, of conducting them in Worship, and Governing the people by the use of the Keys. And that he that destroyeth *one part* that is essential (though he swallow not up all the power) altereth the essence of the Office: and that so the English Diocesan Form doth, I have largely proved in my Treat. of Episcopacy which he doth not answer.

Sect. 13. 1. He tells us that the Presbyters are the lower house in the Convocation, and *so have their Votes in passing all the Rules of Discipline, Articles of Doctrine and Forms of divine Service.* *Ans.* 1. According to his description *the Church of England hath no one Ecclesiastical Government*, either Monarchical or Aristocratical or Democratical: And therefore the Acts of the Convocation are no Acts of governing the Church of *England*, but meer Agreements: Therefore this proveth not the Presbyters power of governing it. 2. If this be a part of Government it is the Legislative Part or the Executive. The later it is not. The former the Lawyers say it is not; King and Parliament only being Legislators. But if this be Legislation, we deny it to be any of the power of the Keys, in question, which is but to judge who is fit or unfit for Church-communion, to Admonish, Absolve or Excommunicate according to Christs Law; and is the execution of Christs Law, and not the making of new Laws. 3. It is *lis sub judice* whether the things here named be any part of true lawful Church-Government: Rules of Discipline, Christ hath made enough, except about meer mutable Accidents. Articles of Doctrine man must not otherwise make, than to declare what he believeth Christ hath made. Forms of Divine Service commanded to all others, the Apostles never made, nor that we find appointed any others to make them. If these be lawful by way of agreement of many Churches, this is none of the Power we speak of. Yet he calls this [*one of the greatest Rights of Government*, *viz.* *making Rules for the whole body*; which he denyeth to have any constitutive Government.

Sect. 14. He saith, [*In this main part of Government our Church falls behind none of the ancient Churches—only there they were taken singly in every City, &c.* *Ans.* That is, 1. When the Ministers of a Diocese choose four, out of whom the Bishops take two, And 2. This only to make agreements, without any governing power over the Church of *England*. 3. And this only about general Regulation. 4. In either unlawful or doubtful Impositions on others about meer Accidents or Circumstantes of Order; This is the same or as good as, when every true Church hath present Pastors personally

personally to exercise the executive Church-Government called the Keys, by the Laws of Christ already made, in judging the case of each particular Person, as to his Title to Church-communion and the Kingdom of Heaven. For that is the thing which by us is pleaded for.

Seet. 15. Next he tells us of *four that are to joyn in Ordination and Examination*; when 1. It is not the making or governing of Pastors which I am speaking of, but the Government of the Flocks. 2. He knoweth that it is no strange thing for our Bishops to say, that both in Conventions and Ordination, the Presbyters act only as the Bishops Council, and the Bishops only act by governing authority. 3. I never disputed for Presbyters Power to ordain as essential to them (nor did I ever meddle in any Ordination.) 4. If four Presbyters have such power that proveth not that four hundred have it, that never exercise it, in the same Diocess. 5. If by all this you mean that really Presbyters have the governing Power of the Keys, it condemneth those the more that give it to four and deny it to four hundred or one thousand. 6. When I was ordained none examined us but the Bishops Chaplain, and two or three City Ministers called by the Bishop that never saw us before, meerly *pro forma* laid hands on us with him. But it's well that you give such a power to ordain.

Seet. 16. Next p. 267. he comes to the point in question, whether they have the Pastoral Power of the Keys over their own Flocks? And 1. He saith, *One would think the objector had never read over the office of Ordination for them. For the Epistle is read, the Charge given by St. Paul to the Elders at Miletus Act 20, or the third Chapter of 1 Tim. concerning the Office of a Bishop. What a great Impertinency had this been, &c?* *Ans.* This is like the rest. I must not suppose that he never read it himself. See Reader, whether any of this be true? Indeed heretofore it was in the Book of Ordination; but we shewed the Bishops that thence Bishop *Usher* in his *Reduction* argued that the Presbyters have some conjunct Power with the Bishops to govern their own particular Flocks, and some true Pastoral Power of the Keys (I was one that oft urged it on them.) And they told us that the Bishop was the Pastor and they but his Curates, and to confute us, *put out both these parts of Scripture from the Book which he saith are in it*; so that neither of them is there: And presently they also put out the very name of *Pastor* given to Parish Ministers, in almost all places of the Liturgy. Doth not all this shew their mind?

Seet. 17. Next he tells us of the Bishops Exhortation, calling them [*the Messengers, Watchmen, Pastors and Stewards of the Lord.*] *Ans.* It was

so in the old Book, But the word (*Pastors*) here also is purposely put out to shew their judgment. Is this just dealing, And doth it not confute himself? 3. He tells us of the *Promise to Minister, Doctrine, Sacraments and Discipline.*] *Ans.* The truth is neither in the exhortation nor collation of Orders, is there any mention of any power given him to govern, but only to administer the Word and Sacraments: and thus far the people are called his charge: But in the question, *Discipline* is named thus [*as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God:*] so that 1. The Priest hereby owneth that as it is received in this Church and Realm it is according to Gods Commandments, and 2. Then promiseth so to use it: which is 1. To be an *Accuser*, 2. And as a *Cryer* to publish the Bishops or Lay-Chancellors *Excommunication* and *Absolutions*. This is the promise.

Sett. 18. And what if the name of *Government* or the Keys had been put in, when it is denyed in its essential part? I have proved out of *Cousins* Tables, *Zouch*, and the Canons and actual Judgment and Practice of the Bishop, that *Government* or *Jurisdiction* is denyed to them: And instanced in many and most acts in which it doth consist, in my Treatise of *Episcopacy*. And this being my question, (whether the English frame depose not the ancient Churches (which had every one their own Pastor with the power of the Keys) and so the ancient Offices and Discipline.) I am not now concerned about the General Archiepiscopal Power of the *Diocesans*.

Sett. 19. p. 269. He saith (that while the Apostles lived it is probable there were no fixed Bishops, or but few.) *Ans.* Mark this Reader. 1. If so, then while they lived, there were but twelve or thirteen Bishops in the World, if any. And were then no more Churches that had governing Pastors? 2. Then if it cannot be proved that the Apostles were fixed Bishops, but ambulatory Apostles, there were none in the World in their times. 3. Then the Angels of the seven Churches were Apostles (reprehended by Christ) or meer Presbyters, or of the few excepted Bishops. Why then doth he himself elsewhere argue that there were Bishops then, because these Cities were Metropoles? 4. See what concord is between the chief Doctors of the Church of England. Dr. *Hammond* saith that it cannot be proved that there were any Presbyters but Bishops in Scripture times: and supposeth the Episcopal Party of his mind. This Dr. saith, (*It's probable there were no fixed Bishops, or but few.* And so they differ. 1. Of the sense of the Texts that mention Presbyters and Bishops. 2. And about the guidance of the Churches *de facto* in those times. 3. And if the Apostles were not fixed Bishops of single Churches, they have no Successors

as such. If they were we must have but twelve or thirteen Bishops as their Successors in the World. And which be those Seats? and how prove they their claim?

Sett. 20. To prove the Parish Ministers Pastoral Power p. 272. he tells us of that *he is judge of the Qualification of those that are to be confirmed.* *Ans.* 1. Had I ever taken a Parish Charge under them, I would have taken more advantage from the new Rubrike about this, than any thing else, and then the Bishops intended. But 1. There is not one of a multitude confirmed, and *desire* of Confirmation proveth not any understanding of Christianity. 2. And if the Minister doubt whether they be *Ready* or capable, they may refuse to give him any account. 3. He is to send in the names of such as he *judgeth fit*. But 1. it's only when the Bishop Summons them. 2. And the Bishop is no way obliged to confirm no more than the Priest approveth of. To prove this, 1. Their ordinary practice is to confirm without the Curates hands: 2. When the Kings Declaration was debated at *Worcester House* 1661, before the K. Lords, Bishops and Ministers, I laboured almost only for this that day, to have got in the word (*Consent*) of the Minister of the Parish for such as should be Confirmed, supposing that *one word* would have partly restored the Parish Pastors power, and so have made our Bishops tolerable Archbishops, that if possible we might have been healed. But the Bishops rejected it with all their might, and got the King to refuse it: But because I laid so great a stress on it, the Lords and others that were to collect and publish the Concessions, when we were gone put it in for that time, and at the Convocation the Bishops cast it all away. Did they not tell us then their sence? And they call him only the *Curate* of the Parish, and not the Pastor. And 4. If this were practicable some good men would practice it, at least this Doctor himself: But I never heard of one that pre-examined his Communicants whether they were *ready and willing to be Confirmed*. 5. And if he did, he would keep away many fit Persons, that scruple our sort of Confirmation. 6. And what is all this to the many thousand Noncommunicants, who quietly remain members of your Churches?

Sett. 21. As to his words p. 275. of power to keep the scandalous from the Sacrament, I have in so many books proved it next to none, and utterly insufficient, that I will not wast time to repeat all here.

Sett. 22. He tells me that in *Can.* 26 is not in *Reformatio Legum Eccles.* *Ans.* But I have before told him, how much more and better is, which would go far to heal us could we obtain it. He saith that [*any one that hath seen them knoweth it to be a mistake, to say it was published by John Fox.* *Ans.* His Reader must be a strong believer, and taken much on his word; 1. I have

have seen them, and spake with men of great understanding that have seen them, that yet judge it no mistake. 2. The Preface of the publisher is like his Style. 3. It is called *Prefatio I. F.* And can every Reader know that *I. F.* meaneth not *John Fox*? 4. Ordinary Tradition saith it was *John Fox's*: And what should I sooner believe in such a case? Instead of proving that they have all a power (to their condemnation) which we see they exercise not, let him procure a real power declared and granted, and it will do more than these words.

Sett. 23. But when it comes to the question whether me may so much as call a sinner to repentance by name before the Church, who rejecteth all more private admonition, he puts the question, whether the obligation to admonish publickly an offender, or to deny him the Sacrament if he will come to it, be so great as to bear him out in the violation of a Law, made by publick authority, &c. *Ans.* The first question is whether Christ have not made his Church so different a thing from the World, that they should be openly differenced, by a *Communion of Saints*? 2. And whether he hath not instituted an office to judge of this and by Government execute it? And 3. Whether any man have authority to suspend this Law or Office? And then 4. I shall grant that not only Discipline, but Preaching and Prayer and Sacraments may be forborn *hic & nunc* in the present exercise, when else the exercise would do more hurt than good. 5. But are these Laws good that forbid it? and should we *Covenant* never to endeavour an *Alteration*?

Sett. 24. He next tells us of the great difficulty of exercising true Discipline, (which is most true) and seems thence to defend the forbearance of it with us. *Ans.* I have in my Treatise of Episcopacy and oft proved that it is of great importance to Christ's ends, and that he would have it continued to the last, and that the Communion of Saints is a practical Article of Faith; and that making small difference between the Church and the World, tends to Church destruction, and to the reproach of Christianity, and the utter undoing of millions of Souls.

And though Pope and Prelates have abused it to captivate Princes and Nations, the just use of it (he knoweth) is mentioned by the Universal Church, and visibly recorded in the Canons of the several ages. Though some Erastians are of late against it; And Jesuits and worldly Protestants can dispense with it when it would hurt their worldly Interest, and turn it chiefly against Gods Servants that displease and cross them.

Sett. 25. p. 284. He saith, [*The want of Discipline in the Parish*

Churches was never thought by old Nonconformists destructive to the being of them.

Answ. They did not confound the *Power* and the *Exercise*: Nor what the *Ministers* office is indeed and from God, and what it is by the *Bishops* Mind and Rules of Conformity. I say as they. 1. The *Exercise* may be suspended without nulling the *Power* or Policy. 2. They are true Pastors and Churches by Gods will, against the will of those that would degrade them.

Señ. 26, But *supposing every man left to his own Conscience, for Communion.* 1. He saith the *greatest Offenders* generally *excommunicate themselves.*

Answ. 1. And is it your way to leave all the rest to their Consciences, and yet to preach and write against, and lay in Jail dissenting godly People that communicate not with you? 2. And are not all these Offenders still Members of your Church? *Albaspineus* complaineth of their Roman French Church, that he never knew any further cast out than from the Sacrament, and left still to other parts of communion as Members; And so do you by thousands who are all Sons of your Church; but we are none.

He is again at it, *what Church I was of*, and I have told him oft enough.

C H A P. VIII.

What the National Church of England is ?

Sect. 1. **A**CCORDING to the Doctors Method we come now to the Explication of one of the terms of our Controversie, so long and loudly called for, *viz. what the National Church of England is, which we must obey, and from which we are said to separate*, p. 287. And the answer is such as may tell Dr. Fulwood and him, that it's time to give over wondering that I understood not what they meant by it.

Sect. 2. Our question is of the Church Policy and Political Form. All writers of Politicks difference a meer *Community*, from a *Political Body*: This is essentiated of the two constitutive Parts, the *Pars Regens* and *Pars subdita*: the former is much like the Soul, and the later the Body. The Ruling Part is called the *Form* by most, and the sorts (*Monarchical, Aristocratical, Democratical* or mixt) the *form in Specie*, as the rational or sensitive Soul to Animals: But the Relative Form is the *Union* of both in their proper order. Such a body Politick is a Kingdom, a City, a Church in the proper and usual sense.

But in a loose sense many other things may be called a Church. As 1. a Community prepared for a governing Form, not yet received. 2. An occasional Congregation about Religion (as Prisoners that pray together; Men that meet about a Religious Consultation or Dispute, &c.) 3. Many Churches as under one Christian Magistrate as an accidental Head. 4. Many Churches associated for mutual help and concord, without any governing Head: Either of one Kingdom or of many. 5. Many Churches as meerly agreeing in Judgment and Love, in distant parts of the World. None of these are Churches *in the political Sense*, but are equivocally so called.

But Politically. 1. All the Christian World is one Church as formed by their Relation to Christ the Head. 2. All single Churches that have Pastors to guide them in the Essentials of the Pastoral Office, are true Churches, formed by this mutual Relation. These two are undoubted.

3. The

3. The now *Roman-Catholick* Church is one by Usurpation, as informed by one Usurping head.

4. A Patriarchal Church is one, as Governed by a Patriarch.

5. A Provincial Church is one as headed by the Metropolitan, or as mixt where Aristocratically others are joyned with him.

6. An Archiepiscopal or Diocefan Church that hath particular Churches and Bishops under it is one as headed by that Diocefan. (*Jure an injuriâ* I dispute not.)

7. A Diocefan Church of many score or hundred Parishes, having no *Episcopus Gregis*, or true Pastors and Pastoral Churches under him, but only half Pastors and Chappels that are but *partes Ecclesie*, is one, even of the lowest sort, in their opinion, as headed by that Diocefan.

8. A Presbyterian Classcal Church is one, as headed by the Classes.

9. A Presbyterian National Church is one, as headed by the General Assembly.

10. An Episcopal National Church is one, either as headed by one National Bishop, or else by a Synod of Bishops Aristocratically; or else by a Synod of Bishops and Presbyters Aristocratically. All these that are constituted of *One Regent* and a *subdite Part*, are called Churches in a Political proper sense, and not only equivocally.

Now the Question is, Of which sort is the *National Church* of England?

And the Doctor saith, page 287. 1. *That the Society of all Christians is counted a true Catholick Church, from their Union and Consent in some common things: and so is ours, &c.*]

Ans. But in what common things? Not in one Bible, for so may Hereticks, much less in one Liturgy. If it be not a consent in one Governing Head, it makes no proper Church.

2. He supposeth an agreement in the same Faith, and under the same Government and Discipline.

Ans. That's right: But what Government is it, Civil, or Ecclesiastical? The first is no essential part of a proper Church. If it be the later, is it *one in specie* or in *individuo politico*? Not the former; for a 100 Episcopal Churches in several Nations may have one species of Government, as many Kingdoms may have. It is therefore the later that is all my Question, *which is the Church-Head?*

He saith [*As several Families make one Kingdom, so several lesser Churches make one National.*]

Answ. True, if that National Church have one Constitutive Head as a Family hath: It's no Family without a *Pater* or *Mater Familias*. And no Governed proper Church without Governours; and there is no Governour where there is no supreme in his place and kind: For inferiours have all their power from the supreme: There is no Universal supreme but God: but the King is subordinately the supreme in his Kingdom in respect to inferiours, and so it is in other Governed Societies.

He addeth [*The name of a Church comprehended the Ecclesiastical Governours and People of whole Cities, and so may be extended to many Cities united under one Civil Government, and the same rules of Religion.*]

Answ. 1. If the question were only *de nomine*, we grant that Civil Courts even of Heathens are usually by Writers called *Ecclesiæ*, and so is any Assembly. If this be all you mean, speak out.

2. Many Nations may agree in the same Rules of Religion, yea, so all Christians do: Doth this constitute National Churches?

3. One Civil Government is of another *species*, and not essential but accidental to a Church, and therefore doth not constitute or individuate it: One Justice of Peace or Mayor in a Christian Corporation, doth not make it one Parish Church. But if this be all your meaning, speak out: we grant *de re* a Christian Kingdom, and contend not *de nomine* if you call it a Church.

§. 3. page 297. 1. As to the difference of a National Church and Kingdom, he granteth what we desire, confessing the difference. But asketh [*whence cometh all this zeal now against a National Church?*]

Answ. An untrue insinuation.

1. To desire to know what it is, is untruly called *zeal* against it.

2. And agreeing with you in the description is no *zeal* against it.

He adds [*The Presbyterians and Mr. Hudson write for it.*]

Answ. Mr. Hudson is a Conformist: And the Presbyterians tell you what they mean, a Christian Nation of particular Churches Governed by One General Assembly as the Supreme Ecclesiastical Government. Whether this be just or unjust is now none of our question. I have oft told what I think of it. Do you also tell us which is your National Church-power and I have done? Are you loth to be understood?

S. 4. But page 299. He cometh to his plain Answer, viz. 1. [*The National Church of England diffusive is the whole Body of Christians in this Nation, consisting of Pastors and People, agreeing in that Faith, Government and worship which are established by the Laws of this Realm.*] And now he [*continues his wonder at those who so confidently say, they cannot tell what we mean by the Church of England.*]

Ans. Yea, your wonder may increase, that I less and less understand it, if you did not after tell us better than in this unhappy definition.

1. Is this called the *Church diffusive* one *Governed body Politick*? If not, it is no Church in the sense in question, and I'll not stick with you for an equivocal name.

2. Do you mean by [*Government agreed in*]. 1. The Civil Government. 2. Or the Ecclesiastical Government of the particular Churches severally. 3. Or one Government of all the National Church?

1. The first makes it no Church in the sense in question.

2. The second makes it no Church, but an Association of many Churches; such as a thousand Independent Churches may make, or the Churches of many Kingdoms. Many Families Associated are no City or one ruled Society if they agree in no Common Governours, but only their several Family Governours. Many Cities associated are no Commonwealth if they agree not in one supreme power. It's no political body without one common Governour, Natural or Collective, Monarchical, Aristocratical or Democratical.

And what is it of [*Worship established by Law*] that individuates your Church? If all that the Law hath established.

1. Your Church hath oft changed its very being, and may do at every Parliament.

2. And the Church is small and unknown, if all that differ in any point established are no parts of it. But if it be *not all* established, who knoweth by this definition what it is, and what is the very matter of your Church. So that here is a definition which neither notifieth matter or form.

S. 5. Next he answereth the Question, *How all the Congregations in England make up this one Church?* and answereth [*By Unity of Consent, as all particular Churches make one Catholick.*]

Answ. Consent to what? 1. If it be not to *one common Government*, it is no Governed Church, as one. 2. Doth he think that the *Catholick Church consenteth not to one Governing Head, Christ?* And doth any thing else make them formally *One Politick body or Church?* This were ill Doctrine.

S. 6. Question, *How comes it to be One National Church?* (Saith he) *I say because it was received by the common consent of the whole Nation in Parliament, as other Laws of the Nation are?*

Answ. Whether, [*How comes it?*] Speak of the *efficient cause*, or the *formal*, or what, it's hard to know, so singular are his Logical notions. But the first is most likely.

And then, 1. The question is still unanswered, *What is the One common Governing power in the Church which this Parliament consent hath set up?* He knows this is the question.

2. And if it be by *Parliament consent*, how old is your Church? What Parliament first made it? It's not so old as *Luther*? Is it no older than the *Liturgy* or *Canons*?

3. Doth it die and live again as oft as *Parliaments* change it? If the corruption of one have been the generation of another, how many Churches of *England* have you had?

4. The whole Nation did not consent by Parliament when the *Lords and Commons* voted down the *Bishops* and *Liturgy*: was there then no *National Church*?

5. How shall we prove that the whole or half the Nation ever meant to put their consent into the hand of the Parliament to make a new Church of *England*, and to alter it?

6. What men make they may destroy. May not the Nation withdraw such consent? and the Parliament unmake their creature?

S. 7. Next, p. 300 he saith [*The Representative Church of England is the Bishops and Presbyters of this Church meeting according to the Laws of the Realm, to consult and advise about matters of Religion. — The consent of both Convocations (of Canterbury and York Provinces) is the Representative National Church of England.*

Answ. 1. So here we have a *Diffusive Church* and its *Representative*, but no Government of either, as a Church, mentioned, but the Civil.

2. And they can be no *Governours* merely as *Representing* those that are no *Governours* themselves. Not as the *peoples Representatives*; for they are no *Church Governours* (whatever elsewhere he saith like

a *Brown*.

a *Brownist* of the Keys being given to *Peter* as representing the whole Church.) Not as the *Presbyters* representatives; For, 1. They are denied Episcopal power, 2. And they are Governours at most but of their particular Churches, and not of the whole. 3. Not as the Bishops representatives, for 1. They are there themselves, 2. And they are no *Common Governours of the whole as such*.

3. If he mean that the two Convocations when they consent become the *One Common Constitutive Governing Power* of the National Church, this is intelligible, but 1. He after denieth any such; 2. And then their dissent would dissolve the Church, and one Convocation not oblige it; (with much more such.)

§. 8. But yet he perceiveth he hath not answered me, and therefore comes to it, page 300, saying, [*It's a false supposition that where-ever there is the true notion of a Church, there must be a Constitutive Regent part, ——— a standing Governing power which is an essential part of it.*]

Ans. A *true notion*, belongeth to equivocals: The *true notion*, and the proper *political notion* are words of various signification. I have granted you that the *true notion* of a Church belongs to a Ship-full, a Prison-full, a House-full, of Christians as such; and to our Parliament, and to the Common-Council of the City: But not the notion now in question.

2. Is not Government essential to a Governed Church? Fixed Government to a fixed Church, and transient temporary Government to an answerable Church? Deny this and few will follow you.

§. 9. He adds, [*“Which I will prove to be false from Mr. B. himself. He asserts that there is one Catholick visible Church, and that all particular Churches headed by their particular Bishops or Pastors, are parts of the Universal Church as a Troop is of an Army, and a City of a Kingdom.——Then it will unavoidably follow, that there must be a Catholick visible Head to a Catholick visible Church. And so Mr. B's. Constitutive-Regent part of a Church hath done the Pope a wonderful kindness——But there are some men in the world that do not attend the advantages they give to Popery, so they may but vent their spleen against the Church of England. But doth not Mr. B. say, that the Universal Church is headed by Christ; I grant he doth: But the Question is of the Visible Church of which particular Churches* “are

“are parts: And they being Visible parts, require a Visible Constitutive Regent Head,——therefore the whole Visible Church must have likewise a Constitutive Visible Regent part — This is to make a Key for Catholics?”

Ans. I am glad he speaketh so intelligibly, in denying a *Constitutive Regent part*; though sorry that he speaks so ill.

1. When I have written against *Johnson, alias Terre* the Papist, two Books on this subject; especially the later fully proving the Catholick Church headed by Christ, to be that visible Church Catholick of which all particulars are members; Can the Reader think I should write it over again, because this Doctor will talk over a little of the same with that Priest, and take no notice of my proof or answer?

2. Doth he believe that the Kingdoms of the World are not visible parts of God's Universal Kingdom? and yet God invisible?

3. Dare he say that all true Churches are not real parts of Christ's Universal Church, as a Governed body? and yet are not they visible? Is it necessary then that the Universal Head must be visible if the subordinate be so?

4. Doth he not perceive that he turneth the Controversie, from the necessity of a *Regent head*, to the necessity of his visibility? As if our question had not been, *Which is the Regent part of the Church of England? but whether it must be visible?* Is this edifying?

5. All Christians are agreed that the Universal Church is Visible. 1. In its parts and members on earth, and their profession. 2. In that Christ the Head was visible on earth; 3. And hath left Visible Universal Laws; 4. And hath a Body visible in Heaven; as the King is to his Courtiers but not to most of his Subjects; 5. And will shortly visibly judge all the World. Thus far and no further (save as seen extraordinarily to *Paul, Stephen, &c.*) is the Universal Head Visible. And are we not agreed that this is a real and most excellent Political Church? and that all other Visible Churches are parts of it? Something besides spleen makes some men talk dangerously.

§. 10. But really doth he think that this doth unavoidably set up the Pope? Why, first is there a word of this that a sober Christian dare deny? or that the Christian World doth not commonly consent to? And do the certain Doctrines of the Gospel and Church set up the Pope? Will he turn Papist if this be proved,
and

and the Christian World be not deceived? Is this our Champion against Popery now? I thought no man but Mr. *Cheny* and some odd Papists had been of this Opinion? But to Mr. *Cheny* and against *Johnson* I have confuted it, and therefore thither refer the Reader. Far be it from me to resist Popery by denying, 1. That Christ's Church thus far visible is one Political body headed by himself, 2. Or that all true visible Churches are parts of it. 3. Or that every Political Governed body is constituted of the *Regent and subdise parts*. Christians will reject me for the former, and Politicians deride me if I hold the last.

§. 11. He proceedeth, [“ 2. The plain resolution is, that we “ deny any necessity of any such Regent Constitutive part, or one “ formal Ecclesiastical Head as essential to a National Church: For a “ National consent is as sufficient to make a National Church as an “ Universal consent to make a Catholick.”]

Ans. No consent maketh a Catholick Church, but consenting to one supreme Head, Christ: But I am glad I understand you.

§. 12. Saith he, [“ Quest. By what way this National consent “ is to be declared? By the Constitutions of this Church the Arch- “ Bishops, Bishops and Presbyters summoned by the King's Writ; “ are to advise and declare their judgments in matters of Religion, “ which received and enacted by Parliament there is as great a Na- “ tional consent as to any Law. And all the Bishops, Ministers and “ People make up this National Church.”]

Ans. Now we are come to the bottom: And, 1. Our question is of the *Constitution* of the Church, and the Doctor tells us the *Administration* makes it. To *consult and advise and make Laws* are acts of *Administration*, and follow the *Constitution*. Men must *have Power* before they *use it*, and must *be a Church* before they *act as a Church*.

2. Yea to *Advise and Consult* are not so much as acts proper to administring Government, but belong to those that are no Governours also.

3. If they be no Laws till the Parliament make them such, then either the Parliament are your Church Head, or you have none that's Ecclesiastical.

But having your plain Confession that you have no such *Regent part*, and so are *no Church Political*, (save Civil) but a meer Association, I ask

§. 13. 1. Why do you pretend that *we are none of the Church of England*, or that we vent our spleen against it or deny it, who deny not Associated Churches in *England* under one Civil Government?

2. How unhappily are the Church-Defenders and Conformists disagreed? Read Mr. *Dodwell* and many such others that take the Church to be a *Governed body Politick*, and see what they will judge of you?

3. Are not you and I liker to be of one Church of *England*, who agree *what it is*, than *you and those Bishops and Doctors* that speak of two different things, and agree not so much as *what it is*?

4. Have you not brought your Defence of the Church of *England* to a fair issue, by denying that there is any such Church, in the questioned political sense?

5. What made you before talk of being under *one Government*? If you meant only Civil? Is your Governed Church as such only Civil, or a Kingdom only?

6. Do you not now absolve all men from the duty of *obeying the Church of England as such*, and from all guilt of disobeying them? How can men Govern that are no Governours? and how can we obey them? It's only the Civil power then that we herein disobey.

If you say that all the Bishops are Governours, and altogether govern the whole; I answer, Yes *per partes*, but not as a *whole or Church*. If twenty Families in a Village agree as Masters and Servants, to go one way as Consenters, this maketh no one Government of the Village. If the Physicians of *London* consent to one Pharmacopeia that maketh them not a body Politick. If twenty Sea Captains consent to go one Voyage by one rule, each one is a Governour of his own Ship, but this maketh no Government of the whole. All the Justices and Mayors of *England* rule the Kingdom *per partes*, by the same Law: But all together make not one Aristocracy to Govern the Kingdom as One whole. Unless your Bishops, &c. are United in One *persona Politica* or *Aristocracy*, they may rule their several Churches, but they make not one common Government for the National Church as such. An agreement of the Emperour, *Spaniard*, and other Confederates make not one Kingdom or body Politick.

7. How can they be Schismatics for disobeying them that are not their Governours.

8. How come Dissenters bound by *Parliament consent*? If it never was in their minds to trust them as Consenters for them? yea and declare their own dissent, as most of the Nation did lately against Prelacy and Liturgy, yea and their chosen representatives? Have such representatives more power to express our consent than we our selves?

9. You unhappily erre with *Hooker* in your popular Politicks, if you think that the Laws bind us only because we consent to them by our Representatives, or that as such they make them. Whereas it is as by *Consenting in the Constitution they are made part of the Rulers or Legislators*, and not merely as if we made the Laws by them.

10. And as to Convocation consent, how binds it all those that never consented to them? How is the City of *London* so bound to Conform, when they had not one chosen Clerk (but only the Dignitaries) in the Convocation that made us our Conformity (the two chosen by them being refused by the Bishops.)

11. Will not you pass for an asserter of the Principles of Independency, that not only say, The Keys are given to the whole body, and the Convocation represent the People, &c. but also that *England* is one Church but by consent, without consenting to any one Constitutive Regent Church head. The *Independants* are for a National Church merely by confederacy and consent, without National Government of it.

12. You go further from the Episcopal Politicks than the Presbyterians do: For they make an *Aristocratical Regent Part*, but you make none.

13. I doubt some Statesmen will be angry with you, that say there is no power of Church Government in *England*, but from the King as Head (as *Crumpton* before *Cousins* Tables, and others ordinarily.)

14. Do you make *England* in essentials any more one Church, than *England* and any Foreigners agreeing are one? Did the Synod of *Dort* make us one with them? Do large Councils make many Nations one Church? Did the Heptarchy make *England* one Kingdom, when seven Kings Governed the whole by parts, but none the whole, as such?

15. I beseech you think what you have done against the *Parochial, Diocesane* and *Provincial Churches* in *England*. Have none of these; have not each of these a *Regent Constitutive part*? Are none of them true Churches in *sensu politico*? You dare not say, No. If they are, You have said that *visible Churches as Parts unavoidably require a visible Head to the whole* (by which I bring in the Pope, because you think Christ will not serve the turn :) And do you not say that all these Churches are parts of the Church of *England*? And if you deny it to have one *Regent part*, do you not then either destroy the rest, or use the name *Church* equivocally to these several sorts so heterogeneal?

16. I pray you tell us, from whom our Arch-bishops receive their power? If you say from the Bishops, and so Inferiours or Equals may give power, why may not Presbyters make Presbyters or Bishops, and *generare speciem*? If it must come from Superiours, the *Church of England* hath none such.

17. If the Peoples consent can make a National Church, why may it not make an Independant or Presbyterian Church?

18. If the Nations consent, as such make the Church of *England*, it is not made by Legislative power of King and Parliament.

19. Do the Clergy represent the King? or is he none of the Church?

20. How prove you that the Clergy represent the Laity in the Convocation?

21. By your Rule, if divers parties of Christians agree to set up divers forms of Church-Government, with mutual forbearance they would be one National Church. And so would Episcopal, Presbyterian and Independants if the Law allowed them all.

22. Was the *Church of England* the same thing in the days of *H. 8. Ed. 6. Q. Mary, Q. Eliz. &c.*

23. Who maketh *National Churches* in absolute Hereditary Monarchies, where are no Parliaments to signify popular consent?

24. If every Law of Order be essential to your Church, few Conformists are of it: If only the true essentials, why are not we also of it?

25. How ill agree you with Mr. *Cheny*, who maketh it Atheism, Infidelity, Blasphemy, Impiety, to assert Church-making consent or confederacies besides Baptism?

26. But

26. But the best is you leave us in hope of Reformation; for if Parliaments will but consent for us to take down Diocesanes lower, and to reform Parish-Churches, and alter Liturgy, &c. we are the *National Church* still. And one prevailing Vote may prove us all consenters; and make the Church quite another thing.

§. 14. Yet he saith [Page 299. *By this description any one may see how easily the Church of England is distinguished from the Papists on one side, and the Dissenters on the other.*]

Answ. I am one, and I cannot see it, nor so much as see how to know the Church it self, nor who is a Member of it, nor how any man can know it: but he seems to me to make it a Church invisible. But I see the Dissenters must be none of it.

1. How was the Church of England known from Papists, in the beginning of H.8. or in the middle, or in the end? or how known when it began?

How was it known in the beginning of Queen Elizabeths days, when the Papists came to Church? or now as to Church-Papists? How shall we know to which Church the late Bishop Bramhall and other Doctors belong, who would have the Pope Govern us according to the Canons as Patriarch of the West, & *principium unitatis universalis*, and all go for Schismatics that deny it. Some call this the *New-Church of England*, differing from the old one which was before Bishop Laud.

2. How shall one know how far consent is necessary to a Member, and dissent unchurcheth him? Lately a Doctor was accused for saying he scrupled to call the King according to the Liturgy, *Our most Religious King*: Mr. Fole of Sarral was suspended for not oftner wearing the Surplice, and denying to pray in the Litany for [Our most Gracious Queen Katherine, and James Duke of York. But these are small dissents; The sense is the Churches Law and Doctrine, and not the sound of words in various senses: I have oft shewed in how many contrary senses the Conformists take the 39 Articles, the Liturgy, the words of Subscription and Declaration, and the Oaths imposed? How shall one know among all these, who are, or are not of your Church? When you tell us that it is [Agreeing in the Faith, Government and Worship which is established by Law] and then speak so hotly against the need and being of any common Government, save the Civil, at all established over the Church as a *National body*, and never distinguish any necessary parts of Faith, Government and Worship,

from the rest, nor tell us how to know them? And when Conformists dissent in so many things; some from Lay Chancellours Government by the Keys, some in the sense of the Articles, and the Non-conformists say they consent to all that Scripture requireth, and the meer Circumstantials determined by Law, how shall you be known? Either it is in the Essentials only, or the Integrals also, or also in all the Laws *de Accedentibus*, that the Church of *England* by agreement is made that *One Church*.

1. If it be only in *Essentials*, is there either Confession, Rubrick, Canon, or any Writer that hath told us *which be those*, and *all those*, and only those Essentials? I never met with man that pretendeth to know them, and therefore never met with man that can thus tell, whether he be of the Church of *England* or not? nor that can tell of others, and who is not?

2. To say it must be consent also in the Integrals that is necessary *ad esse*, is a contradiction: and is to make Integrals Essentials. To say that it must be consent in all Laws of *Accidents* also, is to make that an essential part which is no part. Our loose confounding Disputers, when they have lost the truth in such contradictions, may say as Mr. *Dodwell* doth to me, that I Cavil: But will that answer help down all absurdities with reasonable men? It's plain that as the Papists Doctrine of defining Church-Members and Christians, by no Essential Articles of Faith, but by *Probable Proposal* of more or less doth make their Church invisible, so doth this definition of the Church of *England* by Doctor *Stillingfleet* make theirs, and leave us uncertain who is of it. It makes me think what I hear *Oliver* the Usurper said to a Bishop that now is (as I am credibly told, [*Doctor how know you that you are a true Minister of Christ?*]) who answered him on Mr. *Dodwell's* Principles, [*Because I have received Ordination by uninterrupted successive conveyance from true Bishops, from the Apostles:*] Saith he; *Are you sure they were all true Bishops and the succession uninterrupted? Doctor will you take your Oath that you are thus a true Minister?*] At which when he stuck, [*Come, come, Doctor, saith he, there is a surer and a nearer way.*]

Certain I am, that if Agreement in the sense of the 39 Articles, or in all Forms and Ceremonies be necessary to constitute a Member of the Church of *England*, abundance that subscribe are none, that now go for such: But if not, I pray tell us why such as I also are not Members of your Church. Do I more differ from you than

Doctor.

Doctor Heylin, Mr. Thorndike, Mr. Dodwell, and in a word than the party which adhered to Arch-bishop *Land*, differed from the party which adhered to Bishop *Abbot*, *Whitgift*, and the Parliaments of those and after-times? If the Church of *England* as such a one, be constituted by no supreme Church-Government, we are all of it, so far as we consent to the Association, and none as it is one Political body. And what then becomes of its Laws, and all the Treatises of its Church-Policy?

§. 15. But yet the Doctor stops not here: *I unavoidably introduce Popery if I make a Constitutive Regent Church power, necessary to a Church: for then the Universal Church must have such.*

Ans. 1. It's not necessary to an equivocal ungoverned Church, such as our *Worcestershire* Association made: But to a Political Governed Church it is.

2. Mark here all you that go the Political Church way, that your Doctor accuseth you more than the Nonconformists, even of certain opening the door to Popery. What if I had said so by you? Is it such men that thus make you agents for a Pope?

3. Doth this Political description of Parochial, Diocesane, Provincial, Patriarchal Churches, also bring in Popery?

4. Then either our Archbishops have no power, or they have it from no superiour, or else they infer a Pope.

5. I again tell the Doctor as I did Mr. *Cheny*; It is disingenious to say this to me, when I have written so much against *Johnson* the Priest, in my first, and specially my second answer, which none replyeth to, without any confutation or notice of it: I have fully proved that Christ's Catholick Church hath himself for an Essential Head, sometime visible on earth, leaving visible Laws, and now visible to the Courtiers in Heaven, and coming visibly to judge all; and there is no other. Indeed if the doctrine of Mr. *Dodwell* and many such hold, who deny that the power floweth immediately from Christ's Law or Charter to the Church, and not from the Ordainers or Electors, who do but determine of the Receiver and Invest him, then all the Doctors in *England* cannot answer the Digression, Cap. 14. of the Book called [*The Catholick Hierarchy*,] proving that such a Prelatical subordination of Churches, inferreth a Pope: But I have fully shewed the vanity of that inference as to us.

But remember that the Doctor and I are agreed, that [*A Nation consenting* in an Association of particular Churches, may be called a Na-

a National Church (equivocally,) Though it can make no Laws unless its consent also set up a Supreme Church-Government. Meer Agreements are not Laws.

§. 16. He next would make the unwary Reader think that he answereth my Question, 1. *What is the same Rule that all must walk by, viz. that the Scriptures are the Foundation of our Faith.* — 2. *But our Church requireth Conformity to the Rules appointed by it agreeable to the word of God.*]

Answ. But it seems the Scripture then is not the whole rule, but part: the fundamental part. 2. Which did *Paul* mean? Was your Churches Rule then made? 3. Doth your Church require this *ad esse*, or but *ad melius esse*? If the first, all Canon-breakers are dismembred? And, is that according to God's word? If the later, why am not I of your Church? 4. But how comes that Church to command and bind, which hath no such Ruling power?

C H A P. IX.

Of the Peoples Consent to the Pastoral and Church-Relation.

§. 1. **P**Age 307. Saith the Dean, ["The next thing to be considered is the interest and power of the People as to the choice of their Pastors, for want of which great complaints are made, ——— Mr. *Baxter* is very tragical on this Argument, and keepeth not within tolerable bounds of discretion in pleading the Peoples Cause against Magistrates and Patrons and Laws.]

Ans. 1. That is tolerable to some men, which others cannot bear; Silken ears must have soft words; *The Land cannot bear all his words*, was an old Complaint: And [*Speak pleasing things, Prophecy deceit*] was an old Mandate. It's no wonder if that sort of men, that must judg whether our Preaching, and Worshipping God be tolerable, and must write us down the words which we must say to God in Prayer, or not be tolerated, do also think themselves the meet judges, whether our *indiscretion be intollerable*.

2. But let us try whether he state this Controversie any more Logically or truly than the rest, and whether he intimate not hurtful though tollerable untruth.

1. It's a crooked insinuation, to put the word [*Power*] instead of [*Right and Liberty*], as if [*Power*] of Consenting in the People, and [*Power of Rulers*] were univocal and not equivocal terms: But this is tolerable: For experience hath convinced me, how little Logical strictness is from this Doctor to be expected: I doubt lest next, as some men instead of Learning maintain their reputation by deriding it, we may expect some such defence of the Doctors Logick, to prove that he is none of the *Disputers of this World, who deceive men by vain Philosophy*.

2. And the word [*choice*] instead of [*consent*] is somewhat more crooked: For [*choice*] usually includeth the first nominating
Vote;

Vote; And he knoweth that I pleaded for the necessity of no more, than the *Churches consent*, though it were subsequent to the choice of Magistrates or Patrons.

3. But the next is worse, that [*I plead the Peoples Cause against Magistrates, Patrons and Laws,*] when I do but desire their Conjunction.

§. 2. His repetitions call me tediously to repeat the state of the Controversie (abusiveness quite below him.)

1. I Have oft said, that God hath not made either *Magistrates* or *People* the Judges who is fit to be, and shall be a Minister of Christ in general; but the **ORDAINERS** and the **PERSON** himself conjunct. This is evident, 1. From Scripture Instances of all that were Ordained: 2. From the nature of the thing.

1. Who is supposed so fit to judge as men and Seniors of the same Office? Whobut Physicians are fit to judge who is meet to be a Licensed Physician? And who but Philosophers judge of Graduates and Professours in Philosophy?

2. And no man can make me a Minister against my will, nor know me to be fit, if I know myself to be unfit.

§. 3. II. I have oft said that the Supreme Civil Governour is the Judge, *whom he must countenance, maintain and tolerate*. The proof is easie, 1. Because *to do it* is *his work*; and every man must be a discerning judge of his own work. 2. Because it is a publick act of Government, and he is the chief publick Judge therein.

§. 4. III. I have oft said that the Disposall of the Tythes and Temples is in the power of the Prince, and Patron by his grant. But with these bounds.

1. His power is not *Absolute*, but *Under Christ* and limited by him, and therefore he hath no power against him, nor to cross his Laws or to contradict his ends.

2. If the Tythes and Temples were given only for publick Teachers of Catechumens, or for meer Lecturers, the Magistrate must dispose of them to such as are capable of that Office.

3. If the Tythes and Temples were given for the Pastors of the Churches, the Magistrate is bound to give them to such as are lawfully called to be such Pastors, and not by the advantage of his Trust, overthrow the way of entrance instituted by Christ.

4. However if they were devoted to God, it is God who is the proprietor, and it's sacrilege to alienate them. And an intolerable ill disposal is alienation.

§. 5. IV. I have oft said, that it being supposed that their Ancestors gift of Tythes or Glebe and Temples is the reason of our common *Patronage* and presenting power, the will of the dead Donors is to be observed, and their gifts given to none but on the termes by them determined: But their gifts are supposed to be for the Churches good and not against it: Nor had they any power on pretense of beneficence, to destroy, or to take away more than they give: But the Trusting of our Souls Conduct is a matter of more weight than Tythes and Temples. If Tythes be proved not to be of Divine Right, all that can be expected is, that if the flock cannot trust him whom the Patron chuseth, they let him give his Tythes and Temple to whom he please, and they will trust their souls with such as they dare, and safely may. But if he will chuse and offer them one whom they can safely and comfortably accept, so as Tythes and Temples shall preponderate in case of small difference in the men, prudence obligeth them to accept of the advantage. The same I say of the Magistrates countenance and approbation. But if the difference be very great, it's better stretch our purses to build new Temples and pay our Pastors than trust our souls on the Pastoral Conduct of ignorant, malignant, unfaithful or heretical men.

§. 6. V. I have oft said, that *mutual consent* is necessary to the being of the relation of *Pastor* and *Flock*. And though sometimes the Rulers imposition, and the Patrons choice, may make it the Peoples duty in prudence to *consent*, when the good preponderates the hurt, (not else) yet *till they consent*, the *Relation* is not *existent*. As if Children were bound to take Wives and Husbands by the Command and fore-choice of Parents, yet it's *no Marriage* till they consent.

§. 7. The common objection is from the inconvenience, if the several *parties agree not*: To which I answer.

1. The mischief of the contrary way, is worse than that inconvenience.

2. There is nothing in this World without inconveniences where all things and persons and actions are imperfect.

3. If Parents and Children agree not about their Marriage, it hath great inconveniences; And yet neither *Parents Government*, nor *Childrens consenting Liberty* must be denied.

4. In so weighty a Case, divers Locks and Keys keep the Churches treasure safe. Prince, Patron, People and Ordainers, will not so often agree on a vile person, as any one of them alone may do.

§. 8. And now judge how Logically, how honestly the Doctor hath stated the Case, and made me *Intolerably indiscreet and tragical against Magistrates, Patrons and Laws*. And try if you can understand what it is instead of this, that he would have: I tell him again, that *if he deny the necessity of the flocks consent to the mutual relation*, he notoriously opposeth the judgment and practice of Antiquity and the Universal Church, of Princes, Patriarchs, Prelates, Councils and People, and fights against the full stream of Historical evidence, for a new crooked way, that would make as many modes of Religion as there are different Princes.

And here he wonders what he said, that occasioned *such undecent passion*. It seems he felt some passion in reading it, and thought he must have the like that wrote it. And so let any man obtrude any pernicious thing on the Church, and he can easily prove the detector to have *undecent passion*, for giving a bad Cause its proper name.

§. 9. But he cannot find out the reason of my inference, that then *Princes may impose what Religion they please*.]

Ans. Not understanding, with some men, goes for confuting: To put [*Religion*] for the *mode of Religion* is too little a slip of his to be insisted on. But is not my inference necessary? I urged him to tell me, in what Countries, and under what sort of Princes the Rule holds, that the People must not judge whether the offered Pastors be Hereticks, nor refuse them, if Prince and Patron present them? He will not be entreated to tell me. I tell him, that if the Rule be universal, when a Papist, Socinian, Anabaptist, Antiepiscopeal, &c. Prince and Patron present men of their own mind, and they are instituted, the People must take and trust them as their Pastors: And is not this to set up in all the Churches what modish Religion Prince and Patron please? Is this hard to be understood?

Yet

Yet he calls this *Railing on him for suppositions of my own making*. And here he steps over to another man.

§. 10. Before I come to his undertakings, I will repeat another *railing and undecent passion* against his Cause; And I desire the Reader to note how well the Doctors of the Church of *England* agree; and to learn which of them it is that we must believe, both as to History and Right. It is Mr. *Herbert Thorndike* in his Treatise of *Forbearance of Penal*. [“It is to no purpose to talk of Reformation in the Church, to regular Government, without restoring
“the Liberty of chusing Bishops and the priviledge of enjoying
“them, to the Synods, Clergy and People of each Diocess. So evident
“is the right of Synods, Clergy and People in the making of those
“of whom they consist, and by whom they are to be Governed,
“that I need make no other reason of the neglect of Episcopacy,
“than the neglect of it.”]

Yet these two are Doctors of one Church, but we are no Members of it.

§. 11. I again say that either the Reader hath read the Church History and Canons, or not? If not, how can he tell who to believe that report them? the Doctor or me? But if he have, I will no more dispute this Case with him, than I would do whether *English* Parliaments used to make Laws. He is past my conviction if he be not convinced.

§. 12. And I will again say, that I will yet suppose the Doctor so humble as to acknowledge himself much inferiour to *Paulus Jarpì servita venerunt*, in point of Church History: At least I say to the Reader, peruse what he hath said of this Controversie and of the alteration of Church Government in his History of the Council of *Trent*, and his Book of Church Benefices, lately translated by Dr. *Denton*, and doubt if you can.

§. 13. And in general I add: I. I suppose no man of such reading maketh any doubt of the first 300 years, whether any Bishops were made over any Church without the free Election or Consent of the Flocks and the whole Clergy, and the approbation of the Ordainers. I will not for shame stay to prove this, having said so
much

much of it in my first *Plea for Peace*, and *Episcopal Church History*, which are unanswered.

II. And since the first 300 years, it's so notorious in History that it's a shame to need proof of it, that the Christian Emperours confirmed the Churches in this right and use, and for many hundred years after, permitted and ordered, that Bishops should be chosen by the People, Clergy and Synods, and when the Peoples Election was infringed, the necessity of their consent long continued: And it was only in the choice of the five Patriarchs that the Emperours used to meddle, and that not always, nor at all chusing them alone, but commending some one to the People and Clergy to chuse, or confirming some one that they had nominated. And this held on till Popery sprung up.

III. And even then the Popes long continued it: But, 1. They strove (specially in *Hildebrand's* days and after) against the Emperours negative voice in the confirmation of Popes, 2. And his negative in Investing Bishops: But even in this strife, the Election was confest to be in the Clergy, the People chusing or freely consenting, and no man to be made their Bishop against their will; and it was but the Investiture *per baculum & annulum*, as a confirmation which the Emperours claimed.

§. 14. I have formerly named elder Testimonies not denied: I will now recite but some Canons of Councils.

1. The 9th and 10th Canons of the first great *Nicene* Council nullifieth the very Ordination of scandalous uncapable men: And in the *Arab. Can.* 4. *Si populo placebit*, is made a condition of the Episcopal relation. And c. 5. in case of the Peoples disagreement, the said People must take the most blameless.

2. The *Roman* Council said to be under *Silvester* of 275 Bishops saith, [No Bishop shall Ordain any Clerke, nisi cum omni adunata Ecclesia, but with all the Church united. If this Council be not certain, the very forgers shew the Antiquity of the Churches right and custom.

3. I before named a Council at *Capua* that decreed that the two Bishops at *Antioch* chosen by their two Churches, should live in Love and Peace.

4. *Chrysostom's* Church of *Joannites* would rather separate than forsake their chosen Bishop or his honour, though Emperour, Council and Patriarch

Patriarch was against him : and though *Cyril Alex.* wrote that their breach of Canons was intolerable, and to tolerate them (a few stubborn Nonconformists) would but discourage the obedient.

5. Even the famous Pope *Celestine* who helpt *Austin* against the *Pelagians* Decreed [*Let no man be given a Bishop to the unwilling : Let the sense and desire of the Clergy, the Laity, and Magistracy (ordinis) be required (or necessary.)*]

6. How the people deposed *Theodosius* Bishop of *Synada* and chose another and the change approved, I have elsewhere shewed.

7. After *Atticus* death the Clergy at *Constantinople* were for *Philip* or *Proclus*, but the people chose *Sisinnius* and prevailed.

8. *Sisinnius* sent *Proclus* to be Bishop at *Cyzicum*, but the people refused him and chose another.

9. The *Orleance Council*, an. 540. Can. 3. decreeth about *Ordaining Bishops*, *Qui prapondenus est omnibus ab omnibus eligatur* : as of old, viz. *Let him be chosen by all, who is to be set over all.*

10. An. 541. The *Concil. Avern.* decree c. 2. *That none seek the sacred Office of a Bishop by Votes but by merit, nor seem to get a Divine Office, rebus sed moribus* : and that he ascend to the top of that eminent dignity by the election of all, and not by the favour of a few : and that in choosing Priests there be the greatest care, because, &c.

Therefore another Council at *Orleance* decreed that a Bishop must be ordained in his own Church which he must oversee.

11. Another *Orleance Council* decree, c. 10. *That none get a Bishoprick by gifts or seeking, but with the will of the King, by the election of the Clergy and the Lay-people.* And Can. 11. *And as the ancient Canons have decreed, Let none be made Bishop to an unwilling People (or without the Peoples consent) Nor let the People or the Clergy be inclined to consent, by the oppression of persons in power (a thing not lawful to be spoken.) But if it be otherwise done, let the Bishop be for ever deposed, &c.*

12. I have formerly cited Pope *Gregory I.* his express Decrees herein.

13. *Clodoveus* his Council at *Cabilone* renewed the old Decree, *That all Ordination of Bishops be null, which was otherwise made than by the election of the Com- Provincials, the Clergy and the Citizens.*

14. The General Council called *Quinosexum*, an. 692. decreed Can. 22. *That Bishops and Priests Ordained with Money, and not by Examination and Election, be deposed* : Though the same Council by humane wisdom decreed, Can. 38. *That whatsoever alteration the Imperial power maketh on any City, the Ecclesiastical Order also follow it.* The way by which

which Humane Order overthrew Divine Order and Institutions.

15. And by the way you may conjecture of the Chusers by the Council of *Toletane*, an. 693. under King *Egica*, where the King Preaching to the Bishops (as was then needful) decreeth, *That every Parish that hath twelve Families have their proper Governour. But if it have less than twelve, it shall be part of another's charge.*

16. K. *Pepin* (who advanced the Pope to advance himself, and added the Sword to Excommunication by mischievous decree, yet) altered not the common way of Election, and decreeth that every City (like our Corporations) have a Bishop, and none meddle in another's Diocess without his consent.

17. The choice of Pope *Constantine*, the humiliation of *Stephen*, and many such instances shew that even at *Rome* still the People had the greatest hand in chusing the Pope; and that to Communicate with a Bishop irregularly chosen, was taken for a great sin. And when *Charles Mag.* was gratified as to the Papal Chair, it was but by making him a necessary Confirmer.

18. The *French Constitutions*, l. i. c. 84. objected about this by *Baronius* and *Binius*, say, *Not being ignorant of the sacred Canons, we consented to the Ecclesiastick Orders, to wit, that Bishops be chosen by the Election of the Clergy and People, according to the Statutes of the Canons, out of their own Diocess, without respect of persons or rewards, for the merit of their life, and their gift of wisdom, that by example and word they may every way profit those that are under them.*

19. The old Canons gathered by Pope *Adrian* and sent to *Charles Magn.* recorded by *Canisius*, depose a Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon, guilty of Theft, Fornication or Perjury. And Can. 28. *A Bishop who obtaineth a Church by the secular power, shall be deposed.* And Can. 33. *That no one pray with Hereticks or Schismaticks: Ex conc. Sard.* Can. 2. *A Bishop that by ambition changeth his seat, shall not have so much as Lay Communion at his end: That no Bishop be above three weeks in another City, nor above two weeks from his own Church.* Can. 17. *A Bishop contradicted (by opposers) shall not after be ordained or purged by only three Bishops, but by many.*

And Can. 94. *The people converted from Heresie by another Bishop, may be of his flock, without removing their Parish dwelling where another is Bishop.*

Amongst the other 80 Canons against oppression, as one is, *That no Bishop judge any Priest without the presence of his Clergy, it being void if not so confirmed; So another is against all foreign Judgment, because*

men must be judged by those that are chosen by themselves and not by strangers. And none of the Clergy must be condemned till lawful Accusers be present, and the Accused answer the Charge.

20. The second General Council at *Nice*, though by servility they were for Images, held to the old Church-Canons for Elections, saying *Can. 3.* ‘ Every Election of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, which is ‘ made by Magistrates, shall remain void, by the Canon which saith, ‘ If any Bishop use the secular Magistrates, to obtain by them a Church, ‘ let him be deposed and separated, and all that Communicate with ‘ him.

How much more say these than my [*intolerable indiscretion?*] I fear some will think that all this binds them to more separation than I am for.

The 15 *Can.* forbids them to have two Churches.

Can. 4. condemneth those to *Lex talionis*, as unsufferably mad, that faultily drive any from the Ministry, and segregate them from the Clergy, or shut up the Temples, forbidding God’s worship.

21. By the way, a Council at *Chalons* under *Charles Magn.* finding some Prelates setting on foot an Oath of Obedience to them, thus condemn it:

‘ It is reported of some Brethren (Bishops) that they force them ‘ that they are about to Ordain, to swear that they are worthy, and ‘ will not do contrary to the Canons, and will be obedient to the Bishop that Ordaineth them, and to the Church in which they are Ordained; which Oath, because it is very dangerous, we all ordain ‘ shall be forbidden;] which other Councils after repeat, (yet our Bishops rest much on such an Oath of obedience to them.)

22. What the Electing Churches were may be partly conjectured from the *Concil. Regiaticin.* in *Canisius*, *Can. 6.* That the Arch-Presbyters examine every Master of a Family particularly, and take account of their Families and lives, &c.

A Council at *Soisons* about 852. (a Presbyter by the King’s Command being Ordained to the Church of *Rhemes* irregularly) Decree, That they that are made Presbyters without examination by ignorance, or by dissimulation of the Ordainers, when they are known shall be deposed, because the Catholick Church defendeth that which is irreprehensible, &c.

23. An 855. under *Lotharius Rennigins Lugd.* and others, at a Council decreed, (because that bad King had by imposing corrupted the Clergy) ‘ That because Bishops were set over the Cities that were un- ‘ tried, and almost ignorant of Letters, and unlike the Apostolick pre-
S 2 ‘ script,

‘script, by which means the Ecclesiastical vigor is lost, they will petition the King that when a Bishop was wanting, the Canonical Election by the Clergy and the People may be permitted, that men of tried knowledge and life, and not illiterate men, blinded by covetousness, may be set Bishops over the Flocks.

24. *An.* 857. Pope *Nic.* 1. is chosen by the Emperour *Ludovicus* consent, and by All the People. And he so far maketh the People self-separating judges, as to decree, *Tit.* 11. c. 1. ‘That none hear the Mass of a Priest whom he knoweth undoubtedly to have a Concubine or sub-introduced Woman. *And Can.* 2. That by the Canons he cannot have the honour of Priesthood, that is fallen into Fornication.

25. *An.* 1050, (or thereabout) one of the worst of Popes at a Council at *Rhemes*, was constrained to confirm the old Canon; ‘That no man be promoted to Church-Government but with the election of the Clerks and the People, &c.

26. *An.* 1059. Again a *Roman* Council forbidding all men to joyn with a fornicating Priest, maketh them so far separating judges.

27. About *An.* 1077. A Council at *Rome* reneweth the Canon, nulling all Ordinations made, *aut pretio, precibus aut obsequio*, or that are not made by the common consent of Clergy and People; for such enter not by Christ, &c.

28. From hence the Popes grew to usurp most of the power in choosing Bishops to themselves by degrees, till they got Councils to judge it Heresie for Emperours to claim so much as a confirming investiture. Whence bloody Wars rose. And it’s greatly to be noted that yet these Emperours supposed the Bishops elected by the Clergy and People, and claimed but the said investiture, as is seen in the *formula* of Pope *Paschals* Grant of investitures to them.

29. When they made Princes Investiture Sacrilege (and entring by them) they so far made the People judges of Priests and Communion, as in a Council at *Benevent.* *an.* 1087. *sub Vict.* to decree, ‘That if no Catholick Priest be there, it’s righter to persist without visible Communion, and to Communicate invisibly with the Lord, than by taking it from an Heretick to be separated from God. For what concord hath Christ and Belial? And Simoniacks are Infidels.

30. But were good and bad Bishops in all Ages thus minded, or was it only Popes? I next add that it was one of the Articles charged against *Wickliffe* the Reformer (as before against *Weccelo*, who condemned their Excommunications) *That they that give over Preaching or*
hearing

bearing Gods word, for mens Excommunications, are Excommunicate, and in the day of judgment shall be judged traitors to Christ. Art. 13. in Conc. Const.

Reader, are we not in a hard strait between *Wickliffe* and Dr. *Stillingfleet* ?

31. The same is one of the Articles against *John Hus*, That men must not for Excommunications give over preaching. We grant that they mean *unjust ones*.

32. This became one of the great Controversies with the *Bobemians*, against whom one of the four long Orations were made at *Conc. Basle*. They would never yield that their chosen Ministers should obey the Silencers.

33. Lastly, the *Romans* themselves oft decreed, *That a simoniacal election even of the Pope is plainly null, and conferreth no right or authority to the elected* (though this certainly overthroweth the uninterruptedness of their own Succession.) And how Popes were elected till the device of Cardinals, is well known.

§. 15. If all this be not enough to prove the constant consent of the Christian Churches down from the Apostles for the necessity of the Flocks consent to the relation of the Bishop and Pastors to them, Let him that would have more read all that *Blondel* hath produced, *de jure plebis in regim. Eccles.*

§. 16. I shall next prove the said necessity from the nature of the thing, the work and benefit, and the common nature, interest and reason of mankind, if more light will not put out the eyes of some unwilling men, that are loth to know what they cannot easily be ignorant of.

And 1. Propriety is in order of nature antecedent to Regiment, which supposeth it, and is to order the use of it for common safety and good.

2. As a mans propriety in his Members, Children, acquisitions, is antecedent to Regiment, so much more in his soul which is himself.

3. Nature obligeth all to care for their lives, but yet those must sometime be hazarded for publick good. But the obligation to please God and obtain Salvation and escape Sin and Hell, is so great, that no man is to pretend publick good or the will of man against it.

4. Self-government (as to power and obligation) is antecedent to humane publick Government in order of Nature: And publick Government doth not destroy it, but regulate it: And therefore is not for destruction but for edification.

5. The end of Self-government is so much to please God and save our Souls, that no man on pretence of publick Government can disoblige us from this.

6. God hath in the fifth Commandment, which setteth humane Government and obedience, chosen the name of Parents rather than Princes, because Parents Government is antecedent to Princes, and Princes cannot take it from them, nor disoblige their Children. But Self-government is more natural than Parents, and Parents and Princes must help it, but not destroy it.

7. When persons want natural capacity for Self-government (as Infants and Ideots and mad-men) they are to be governed by force as bruits, being not capable of more.

8. Family Government being in order next to personal, Princes or Bishops have no right to overthrow it, (at least except in part on slaves of whose lives they have absolute power:) If the King impose Wives, Servants, and Diet on all his Subjects, they may lawfully chuse fitter for themselves if they can; and at least may refuse unmeet Wives and Servants, and mortal or hurtful Meats and Drinks.

9. Much more if Princes and Patrons will impose on all men, the Bishops and Pastors, to whose charge, care and Pastoral conduct they must commit their Souls, the people having the nearest right of choice, and strongest obligation, must refuse (as discerning Self-governing judges) such whose heresie, negligence, ignorance, malignity, or treachery, is like either apparently to hazard them, or to deprive them of that Pastoral help which they find needful for them, and they have right to as well as other men.

10. The gain or loss is more the Patients than the Imposers: It is their own Souls that are like to be profited and saved by needful helps, or lost for want of them: And therefore it most concerns themselves, to know what helps they chuse.

11. If all the Kings on earth command men to trust their lives to a Physician who they have just cause to believe, is like to kill them, by ignorance, error, or treachery, or to a Pilot or Boat-man that is like to drown them, they are not bound to obey such mandates. Yea if they know an able faithful Physician that is most like to cure them, they may chuse him before an unknown man, though the King be against their choice.

12. Scripture and experience tell us, that God worketh usually according to the aptitude of means and instruments. ~~world~~ learned experienced Physicians cure more than the ignorant, rash, and slothful; and

and good Scholars make their Pupils more learned than the ignorant do. And skilful, able, experienced holy Pastors, convert and edifie much more than ignorant and vicious men: And means must accordingly be chosen.

13. If the Pastoral work skilfully and faithfully done, be needful, it must not be neglected whoever forbid it: If it be not needful, what is the Church of *England* good for, more than Infidels, or at least than *Moscovites*? And for what are they maintained by Tythes, Glebe, and all the dignities, honours and wealth they have? And for what do men so much contend for them?

14. It is natural to generate the like; and for men to do and chuse as they are, and as their interest leadeth them. Christ tells us how hard it is for a rich man to be saved, and how few such prove good. And the Clergy themselves do not say that all the Patrons in *England* are wise and pious: Many Parliaments have by our Church-men been deeply accused: And most Parliament men, I think, are Patrons: Others say, that most Patrons not chosen to Parliaments are worse. Some Preachers complain of Great men for fornication, drunkenness, excess, idleness, yea, Atheism or infidelity: If many or any be such, are they like to chuse such Pastors as all godly men may trust in so great a Case? Or would not such Princes chuse such Bishops?

15. Men are as able and as much obliged now to take heed to whose conduct they trust their Souls, as they were in all former Ages of the Church, forecited.

16. The Laws and Bishops of *England* allow all men liberty to chuse what Church and Pastor, that Conformeth, they please; so they will but remove their dwellings into the Parish which they affect. And in *London* thousands live as Lodgers, and may easily go under whom they will chuse; And if they like him not, may shift as oft as they please.

17. Parish bounds are of much use for Order: But Order is for the thing ordered, and not against it: And Parish bounds being of humane make, cannot justly be preferr'd before the needful edification and safety of mens Souls, though such humane Laws bind, where there are no greater obligations against them.

18. The Law of keeping to Parish Churches where we dwell, and the Law that giveth Patrons the choice of all the Pastors, and Princes of Bishops, are of the same efficient power and strength.

19. Casuists usually say (even Papists that are too much for Papal power) that humane Laws bind not when they are against the end,
the

the common good, especially against mens salvation. And a *Toletan* Council decreeth, *that none of their Canons shall be interpreted to bind ad culpam, but ad poenam, lest they cause mens damnation.* And many Casuists say, that *Penal Laws* bind only to do or suffer, and bearing the penalty satisfieth them, save as to scandal.

20. Yet we still acknowledge all the right in Princes and Patrons before-mentioned, and that Princes are bound to promote Learning and piety, and so to see that due places, countenance and maintenance encourage faithful Ministers, and that all the Subjects have meet Teachers, and submit to hear and learn; And that they should restrain Hereticks and Soul-betrayers, from the sacred Office-work; and judg who are to be maintained, and who to be tolerated.

21. But this power is not absolute but bounded: And if on the pretence of it, they would betray the Church and starve Souls (like the *English* Canon that binds all from going to an able Pastor at the next Parish, from an ignorant unpreaching vicious Reader,) men are not bound to obey it, but to provide better for themselves (unless *materially*, not *formally* for some time, when not obeying would do more hurt than good;) or as a man must forbear publick assemblies in a common Plague-time.

And so much to open the true reason of the case in hand. And *Paul's* words to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. tell me, this care is not unnecessary, *Take heed to thy self and to the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thy self and them that hear thee.*

§. 17. I come now to the Doctor's words, who p. 312. undertakes to prove, 1. *That the main ground of the peoples Interest was founded on the Apostles Canon [A Bishop must be blameless.]*

Ans. The word [*main*] may do him service, but no hurt to my cause. [*Main*] signifieth not [*Only*.] who doubts but the People were to discern the Lives of chosen persons? But (without coming to the Ballance, among many causes which is the *main*) I have proved that there were more; And among others, that Christ and his Apostles bid them *take heed how they hear: beware of false Prophets, and their leaven: beware of the concision. A man that is an Heretick avoid, — Bid them not good speed: Let no man deceive you, — Those that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine ye have learned, avoid, — from such turn away.* — Is here no more than judging their lives?

§. 18. Here he cometh to prove this even by *Cyprian's* Epistle against *Martial* and *Basilides*: I must not name his dealing with it, lest he say *I rail*. But I may note, 1. that he saith, [*the force of what* *Cyprian*

Cyprian saith comes at last only to this giving Testimony.]

Ans. Only here is more than *Main* before. And though it was a matter of scandal that was before them, and therefore it is no wonder if nothing else be particularly spoken of; yet sure these words signifie more than Testimony. [By publick judgment and Testimony be approved worthy and meet.] And to be found in the faith, and apt to teach is some part of meetness. And [because they chiefly have power either to chuse Priests that are worthy, or refuse the unworthy.] A chief chusing power of the worthy is more than a meer testimony of fact. Again, [that by the suffrage of the whole fraternity the Episcopacy be delivered to him.] Suffrage is more than testimony of fact. And [All they do sin who are defiled by the sacrifice of a prophane and unjust Priest] signifieth a dissenting power, or else separation were no duty.

But he saith, *This is the strongest testimony in antiquity for the peoples power.*

Ans. A strange saying of so good an Historian, who may easily know that the concurrent judgment of all the Churches, their practice, and their Canons, making the Peop's consent (and usually Election) necessary, was a far stronger testimony than one Epistle. But to weaken this he saith,

1. *It was in a case where a Bishop had voluntarily resigned.*

Ans. 1. What's that to the general rule here asserted? 2. Was it voluntarily which they were adjudged to do? But I find no mention of *Marial's* voluntary resigning, but only *Basilides*.

2. He saith [Another Bishop was put in his place, not by the power of the people, &c.]

Ans. 1. This was before said [that the people might give them power? No.] As if he would have the Reader think that we hold the people give the power, which I have so oft disproved. But it's his advantage to talk to many men at once, that he may say, *some of you said it.*

But if distinction were not a crime, I would distinguish between giving the power, and concurring with other Causes to give a Receptivity to the person that must have it: The peoples consent is a *causa partialis*, of capacity and receptivity.

2. But what signifie these words [The Ordination of our Colleague *Sabinus* by the suffrage of the whole fraternity, and by the judgment of the Bishops, &c.] Is not this as much power as we plead for?

3. Are not you the Author of the Defence of *B. Laud*, and say, *That Christ gave the Keys to Peter as the representative of the whole Church?* And have you now said more against me or your self? I am not of that mind.

3. He saith, *They had the judgment of a whole Council for deserting him.*

Ans. Yes, for deserting *them both*? And that Council told them God had fore-determined in his word what men must or must not be Bishops, and it was God rather than they that judged it and bound them to obey; and that the power was chiefly in the people to chuse and refuse &c.] Did you think you had helpt your cause by saying, *It was a whole Council that was for what we say?*

4. He saith, *It was for Idolatry and blasphemy by his own confession.*

Ans. Which mean you by [*his*] when they were two? neither of them were otherwise Idolaters than as *Libellaticks* (who to save their lives suffered other men to subscribe their names, thinking it was not their own deed; like some that I have heard of, that thought Conformity Perjury, &c. but let a Friend bribe an Officer to subscribe their names and give them a Certificate.) And *Basilides* blasphemy was in his sickness in terrour of Conscience and perhaps phrensie.

5. He saith all St. Cyprian's proof is, *that the people were most concerned to give testimony of life, &c.* This is answered already.

§. 19. His next is, *The people on this assuming the power of Elections, caused great disturbance and disorders in the Church;* where he goeth over some few of the many instances, which I have at large recited, at *Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, &c.*

Ans. 1. And yet for all these disorders, the Church deprived not the People of their priviledge.

2. But how fallaciouly is this urged? I have fully elsewhere opened to the Reader, how the aspiring Prelates seeking Patriarchates and Bishopricks became as so many Captains at War, and gathered Monks, Clergy and People to strive and fight for them; And now he layeth this on the People? As if the common Souldiers and not the Generals were the cause of the War? But of this I have said enough.

§. 20. He saith, *To prevent this many Bishops were made without the choice of the People, and Canons made to regulate Elections.*

Ans. Craftily said! He saith not [*without the consent of the People,*] but [*the Election.*] And he saith not that the Canons took away either *consenting or electing* suffrages, but that they *regulated them*: Yes, they over and over confirmed them.

§. 21. He saith, *At Alexandria the Election belonged to the twelve Presbyters.*

Ans. They are hard put to it when they are put to fly to that testimony which maketh Presbyters the makers of Bishops.

Hierome and *Eutychius Alexand.* tell you that the Presbyters chose and made the Bishops as the Army doth a General: which made Arch-Bishop

Bishop *Usher* tell King *Charles* the First, That the Presbyters at *Alexandria* did more than Ordain Presbyters, for they made Bishops (as he told me himself.) But 1. We never denied that the Com-provincial Bishops ordinarily afterwards Ordained them, 2. Nor that the Presbyters chose them. Did the Doctor think this was to the purpose? But 1. Doth he think that the Presbyters choice excludeth the Peoples, when it is a known thing that the Canons and Custom constantly conjoynd them?

2. Will he conclude that when-ever History nameth not the Peoples choice, they are left out?

3. Will he perswade us when the People are not the chusers, that they are not necessarily the consenters or refusers?

I will add one more proof to all before-mentioned. It is impossible, *ex natura rei*, that the Pastoral Office should be exercised on dissenters: Therefore their consent is necessary.

A Patient may be drencht like a Horse, and cram'd like fatted Fowl, and so may have a Physician against his will: But a Soul cannot use Pastoral help unwillingly. 1. He cannot unwillingly be baptized: 2. Nor unwillingly joyn in publick prayer and praise with the Church. 3. Nor unwillingly confess sin. 4. Nor unwillingly crave or receive Ministerial counsel. 5. Nor unwillingly receive the Lords Supper. 6. Nor unwillingly desire the Pastors visitation and prayers in his sickness. 7. Nor unwillingly seek and receive absolution, &c. I mean, he can do none of this that doth not consent. And is he a Pastor to such men that refuse all this? It's a shame to think that learned men should bend their wits to prove that the Sun is not light.

Did the Church at *Alexandria* ever after chuse their Bishops, and not before? All the *Alexandrian* Church-History tells us that the people there indeed exercised too great power, after this, no place on earth more tumultuous and unruly: And yet no place where the Bishops were more secular, and more assumed the power of the Sword: But the people chose them.

4. And if it had been true that the choice lay only and absolutely on the Presbyters, how came they to have so long two Bishops and two Churches, besides the *Arians*?

5. And he wisely overlooketh the Question, who chose those Presbyters that were the chusers of the Bishop?

6. 22. He next instanceth, *ex Euseb. l. 6. c. 10.* in *Germanion* and *Gordius* Ordained by the Bishops in *Narcissus* place at *Hierusalem*.

Answ. 1. His argument, if any, must be this: *Eusebius* saith, the

Bishops Ordained them, not mentioning the peoples consent or choice : Ergo, their consent or choice was not used. How easily might he have known that we would deny the consequence? Doth any of us deny that the Bishops were the Ordainers of Bishops? 2. And even the words of Eusebius confute him, saying, That when Narcissus shewed himself again, the brethren (no doubt the Laity) intreated him to enjoy his Bishoprick again.

§. 23. His next instance is, [*Severus Bishop of Milevis, in his life-time appointed his Successour, acquainting only the Clergy with it : And Augustine prevented the peoples disturbance and got them to receive him.*]

Ans. Thus it is some mens work to confute themselves. It's a known thing that the peoples right was so universally and unquestionably acknowledged, that the Canons forbad any Bishop to nominate and chuse his Successour, lest it should forestall them and prejudice their choice. And why else was the peoples resistance feared? And what did *Austin* but perswade them to consent? And why doth he mention that the People consented and received him, if they had no consenting Vote, or right on just cause to dissent? It would be an odd argument to prove, that a woman had no power of choice in Marriage, because one was put to perswade her to consent? which proveth the necessity of her consenting.

§. 24. He next tells us of *Austin's* own nomination of his Successour *Eradius*.

Ans. More and more against himself. All that men do is in danger of miscarrying by their faultiness : Wise men would do their best to prevent this, and the peoples consent being of necessity, they sometimes will pre-engage them ; so *Austin's* predecessour thought it the craftiest way in his life-time, to take in *Austin* for his Coadjutor or fellow Bishop (two in a City) lest the people should miss of so excellent a man : But this being against the Canons, *Austin* confesseth that he did it ignorantly, and disowneth it. Yet lest the people (who grew more and more faulty) should mischuse, he in his life-time commendeth to them *Eradius*, that their love to him might procure their acceptance. Doth not this prove that their choice or consent was necessary? Reader, if the Doctor can perswade thee that the Country have not the choice of Parliament men, because some are commended or named to them, thy yielding is too easie.

§. 25. The next is the story of *Paul* the *Novatian* out of *Socrat. l. 8.* (who hath but seven) *Paulus* was advising his Clergy to chuse his Successour; They told him their fear of their own disagreement, and to prevent

prevent it, intreated him to nominate one. He made them promise to stand to it, and named *Mercianus* in a sealed paper. Doth not this instance prove, that the Bishop had not power to chuse one of himself? And was not his fear of the disagreement of the Clergy? And doth any of this disprove the peoples consenting right? And would the Doctor perswade us that even the *Novatians* excluded them.

§. 26. He tells us, that the *Greek Canonists think that the Council of Nice took away all the power of election of Bishops from the people, and gave it to the Bishops of the Province.*]

Answ. 1. In all reason he should have cited those Canonists; for it's strange that yet their following Customs and Canons should say the contrary. 2. There is not a word in the Canon cited about election, but only *ordination* [that all the Bishops in the Province should Ordain a Bishop; But when that cannot be, there shall be at least three present, and three more consenting by writing.] And what's this to the Case of the Peoples election or consent?

§. 27. Yet he bringeth more against himself, viz. Can. 18. *Concil. Antioch.* which is, *That if one be Ordained Bishop and go not to the Parish, because the people refuse him, he shall have the honour and Office of a Bishop, not troubling the peace of the Church;*] which plainly saith what I have oft said, *That the people have no power to hinder any from being Ministers or Bishops indefinitely in the Church Universal,* but only to judge whether he shall be *theirs*: whereas the Ordainers have power in both cases; and usually were the first chusers, though the people had a refusing or accepting power, as there appeared cause.

§. 28. Next he addeth more for what I plead, that *Basil* Ordaining one first, *perswades the Senate and People to accept him*: Adding [Their way then was, if the people did agree on a person to be Bishop, to petition the Metropolitan and Synod, who had the full power to allow or refuse him.]

Answ. Is not this a strong proof that the people had no such agreeing or chusing power, because the Metropolitan and Synod also had their vote? what need *Basil* perswade them to accept him, when they had no power to refuse? Did *Basil* or any Synod say, all people are bound to accept those whom we chuse, be they what they will, and not to try them and judge themselves.

§. 29. And here I desire the Reader to remember, 1. That we take the chief trust to be by Christ committed to the Ordainers for taking in fit men, and keeping out the unfit: They being the only Judges (with the person himself) who shall be a Minister of Christ in the Church

Church Universal; And neither Magistrate or People have a power to chuse or refuse them.

2. That the Universal Church being one body of Christ, though Ministers have not such a charge of each others flocks as the particular Bishops of them have, yet are they bound to give them all the help they can (as neighbour families to help each other :) And therefore to offer to vacant Churches the best they know, and perswade them to accept them, when they are at a loss or need advice.

3. The people are bound to reverence the judgment of neighbour Pastors herein, and not caustlessly to oppose.

4. When the People have chosen (or they and the Clergy,) if the person were not before Ordained, the Ordainers still are judges for their own act.

5. It was not usual to Ordain *sine titulo*, and the Ordainers did two things at once, 1. Judge absolutely *who shall be a Minister of Christ?* 2. Judge with the Church to which he was Ordained (Elders and People) who was fit for that Church, and should be theirs: And a threefold lock was safe.

6. By all this it appears that all the Doctors talk against the peoples unsuitness to discern who are sound or Heretick, fit or unfit, is to no purpose: And that if unmeet men are Ministers or Bishops, the fault is ten times more in the Ordainers than in the People: seeing it is not the People but the Ordainers that are trusted to take into the Ministry indefinitely, but only among many to judg who shall be theirs, supposing them either before Ministers, or next to be made such by the Ordainers. And doth the Doctor think that the judgment of all parties is not as sure as of one alone? or that my refusing a Physician is any wrong to his Licensers or him?

§. 30. The *Laodicean* Canon cited by him speaketh for me as the rest: (Did he think I wanted his help to cite more for my self?) Who doubteth that the People being not the sole judges, if they took in an un-Ordained or un-approved man without the Synods consent, it was void? (By the way, do either Synods or People (the old chusers) chuse our Bishops or Priests?)

§. 31. Yet more for me, he citeth the *Chalced.* Council, turning out *Bassianus* and *Stephanus* from *Ephesus*, two men that strove and fought for the Bishoprick unto blood in the Church, and both pleaded they were lawfully called by Clergy, and People, (And yet had the People no right?) But they were both proved to be violent Intruders, and another chosen. And who doubts but a great General Council had the greatest power then?

S. 32. Next he tells us of a Law of *Justinian*, that made the *Clergy* and better sort of *Citizens* chusers. (And indeed *Nazianzene* once wisht the more religious sort were chusers:) but doth not this prove still the peoples power, though so long after by an Emperour the poorer were so restrained? I will not stay to search the Book, but take it as he citeth it.

S. 33. But his next seemeth to be downright against us, Can. 13. *Conc. Laodic.* But it is not so: *Crab* hath two translations: The first saith, *Quod non sit permittendum turbis electiones eorum facere qui sunt ad sacerdotium provehendi: It is not sufferable to chuse by tumults: ergo, not for the people to chuse at all, no nor dissent.* I deny the consequence. To forbid disorder is not to forbid choice or free consent.

S. 34. His next proof is *Nic. Conc. 2. c. 3.* which he saith, *restrain- ed the election only to Bishops.*

Ans. Such dealing tells us that Protestant Doctors are not to be taken for infallible no more than Papists; I cited the Canon before: The doubt is whether it drive us not to more separation than we are willing of, by nullifying our Bishops and Priests calling. It is [every election of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, which is made by Magistrates; shall remain void, by the Canon which saith, if any Bishop use the secular Magistrates to obtain by them a Church, let him be deposed and separated, and all that communicate with him.] Doth not the Doctor unhappily chuse his testimonies? Had it not been better to have past over this Council? Where now is all the Church of *England* by this Canon, if Bishops coming in by the King, and Parsons by the Patrons be all void and null, and the people separated that communicate with them? Such events are the fate of an ill cause. And the next Canon doth not amend their matter, which calleth it madness for gain or any affection of his own, to drive any from the Ministry, or segregate one of his Clergy, he shall have *Lextalionis*, and his work shall fall on his own head.

S. 35. He adds, [Which was confirmed by following Councils in the Greek Church, as Can. 28. *Const.* against *Photius*, and the people are there excluded with an *Anathema*, so far were popular elections grown out of request in the Eastern Empire.]

Ans. 1. Had this been true, it would not much move me, that these two Councils that set up *Image-worship*, and shewed much wickedness, should contradict the Apostolical and Catholick constitutions and practice. But, 1. I thank the Bishops, I am not able to buy the *French* Volumes of the Councils, and therefore what is there I know not: and my own Library is ruined to avoid their Agents dis-
straining

straining it for my Preaching: And Doctor *James* and others have taught me to prefer the oldest Editions of the Councils, and to take heed how I trust the later and the Jesuits pretended Manuscripts. I have now none but *Crab* (who medleth not with this) and *Binnius*; And in *Binnius* there are but 14 Canons in the last Action, and 27 in the antecedent *Fragmenta*: and no such thing as a 28th Canon to be found: Nor is there in the 27th any such thing as the Doctor citeth.

2. But if there were, if it were but the confirmation of the 2. *Nicene* Canon, it were much against the Doctor's cause, and nothing for him.

3. But unhappily here also he sends us to find out much against him. For besides that the 8th Can. in *Fragm.* condemneth requiring subscriptions to stick to the Patriarch (though they were not yet oaths of obedience) the 12th Canon is indeed the same with those forecited, viz. "That the Apostolical and Synodical Canons flatly
"forbidding promotions and consecrations of Bishops, by the power
"and command of Princes, we concordantly define, and sentence,
"that if any Bishop receive the consecration of such a dignity, by
"the craft and tyranny of Princes, he shall be altogether deposed, as
"one that desired and consented to have the gift of God by the will
"of carnal sense, and from men and by men.

I suppose this is the Doctor's Canon which deposeth all the *English* Bishops, unhappily cited. And the Can. 14. requiring Princes to honour Bishops, and condemning the Bishops that debase themselves to go far from their Church to meet a Prince, and that will alight to them from their Horses, and that will basely kneel to them, or will come to their tables, unless with purpose freely to reprove them] expoundeth both these Bishops hearts and words. And so doth *Can.* 17. which condemneth such as come not to Synods because the Prince forbiddeth them, and saith, *That Princes have no right so much as to be spectators of the matters which at Synods fall out among Priests.* And here indeed an Anathema is pronounced against the obstinately disobedient Bishops, that will not obey their Patriarch before *the forbidding Prince.*] And doth this meddle with the peoples Recipient power? which is only levelled against Princes and Lay Patrons Impositions, and deposeth the *English* Clergy and Church?

The same is repeated, *Can.* 25. (which it's likely is that which he meant) viz. "That according to the old Canons the promotions
"and consecrations of Bishops be made by the choice and decree of the

“ the College, and that no Lay Princes or men in power (*potentiam*)
 “ do mix themselves in the election or promotion of Patriarchs, Me-
 “ tropolitan, or any Bishop; lest hence there be inordinate confu-
 “ sion or contention, specially seeing that it is not convenient that
 “ any Potentates or other Lay men have power in such matters,
 “ but rather attend with silence. — And if any secular Prince or
 “ Potentate (men in power) or Lay men of other dignity, strive
 “ against the common and consonant and Canonical Election of the
 “ Ecclesiastical Order, let him be anathema, till he consent and obey
 “ in this, which the Church shall shew its will in, in the Election and
 “ Ordination of its Proper Bishops.

Here, 1. The Churches will is made the determiner of the Ele-
 ction and Ordination of their proper Bishop. 2. The Canonical
 Order is established (which ever required the Clergies and Peoples
 consent.) 3. Nothing of the Laity but acts of Princes power and dig-
 nity is excluded: 4. And hereby our *English* Clergy deposed. The
 Doctor had been better to have let alone his History and Anti-
 quities.

§. 36. His 4th note is, *Christian Magistrates did interpose in this mat-
 ter as they judged expedient.*

Answ. Hitherto he hath produced the Testimonies of Councils
 and Bishops against Magistrates choice or medlings (mistakingly think-
 ing it had been against the Flocks Receptive power) And now he
 will prove that Magistrates interposed, as you shall hear.

§. 37. And first [*So Constantine did in the Church of Antioch. See.
 l. 2. c. 19.*

Answ. What did he? He motioned a Bishop to end the difference;
 And who opposeth that?

§. 38. Next [*Constantius* put by two that the people strove about,
 and set up *Euseb. Nicom.*

Answ. An unhappy testimony: *Socrates* whom he citeth thus rela-
 teth it, [*Alexander dying commended Paulus to the chusers as the fittest;
 but if they would have a man of prowess to chuse Macedonius.*] The people
 were divided in the choice, and made a greater stir than formerly;
 But the Orthodox carried it for *Paulus* against the Hereticks that
 were for *Macedonius*. *Constantius* being the first persecuting *Arian*
 Emperour, was offended, and got a Council to depose *Paulus*, and
 he got in his great favourite *Eusebius Nicomed.* the head of all the *A-*
rians. Doth not this shew, 1. That the people were chusers, 2. That
 the Emperour deposed him not, but by a packt Council of Bishops
 U (which

(which we know had a deposing power?) 3. That this is Recorded as an Act of two Hereticks, a Prince and Prelate, wronging the Church.

§. 39. Saith he, [*When Eusebius was dead, the Orthodox party again chose Paulus, and Constantius sends Hermogenes to drive him out by force.*]

Ans. 1. I doubt he will next cite *Valens, Gensericus, Hunnericus, &c.* for murdering and persecuting the Bishops. Was an *Arians* Tyranny, a note of right?

2. The story (in *Socrates* cited by him) is this: *Euseb.* the *Arian* being dead, the People again went to the choice, and chose as before: But some were kill'd in the tumult. The *Arian* Emperour sends *Hermogenes* to force out *Paulus* the chosen Bishop: The people tumultuously fight for their Bishop and privilege, and set *Hermogenes* Lodgings on fire and kill him. The Emperour comes from *Antioch*, amerceth the City, and puts *Paul* out, and yet is angry that *Macedonius* was chosen by the other part without his advice; but consenteth to him.

1. Doth not this shew that the people were the chusers? 2. And even their murderous tumult moved neither an Heretick Prince nor the Bishops to deny their right of choice. 3. Murder and such violence was a fair colour for more severity. 4. Yet all this was by a Heretick noted as an act against the Church. 5. And all this was but about a Patriarch, and not an ordinary Bishop, and that at his Imperial seat, where it concerned the Emperours to have most regard. 6. And I told you that Princes are the Judges whom they should tolerate, whoever have the choice.

§. 40. He adds, *When Athanasius was restored, Constantius declared it was by the decree of the Synod and by his consent.*

Ans. 1. If he meant here to intimate the exclusion of the peoples consent or choice, he could scarce have named in History an instance more against himself, than that of *Athanasius*, who thereby was brought in, upheld and oft restored. 2. This History tells you the *Arian* Emperour was forced to this consent, to avoid a threatned War from his brother. 3. This was not to make him Bishop, but to call him to his flock from his banishment. 4. And doth not all this confirm what I plead for, as to the Peoples, Synods and Princes several parts?

§. 41. *Nectarius* case is next, about whom *Historians* disagree, but the most credible say, that the Council named *Nectarius* with some others

others in a paper, and in honour to an excellent Emperour, bid him take which he would : But all this excluded not the peoples part (who would not have left *Gregory* but by his own request) and were glad to accept one from such a Council and Prince.

§. 42. Next he saith out of *Sozomen*, *That the People and Clergy chose Chrysostome, and Arcadius consented*; and then he affronteth *Sozomen* with *Palladius*.

Answ. 1. *Palladius* denyeth nothing that I plead for, but only tells us of the Emperours premotion and endeavours, (in his Royal City about a Patriarch) to prevent the division of the people : Nor is *Palladius* credit to be equalled to *Sozomen*'s herein, much less preferred. 2. *Socrates* the most credible of all in this, saith, *l. 6. c. 2.* [*It seemed good to them to send for John Chrys.* — *Wherefore not long after, Arcadius with the general consent both of Priests and People sent for him.*] And did not the Doctor think I needed help by such Citations?

§. 43. The choice of *Nestorius* was just such another. The people had no reason to deny consent to one out of *Chrysostom*'s Monastery, nominated by so good an Emperour; who was judge whom to tolerate in his Royal City: But both he and they after repented of the choice.

§. 44. His last instance is *Theodosius* getting in *Proclus* before *Maximianus* was buried.

Answ. Reader, 1. All this is a good Emperours care about one Patriarch of his own City to avoid division, and nothing to the common choice of Bishops.

2. The true case *Socrates* (cited) thus describeth: The people were the chusers: They were for *Proclus*; but some adversaries objected a Canon, that a Bishop might not be removed from one Church to another, and he being a Bishop already they could not have him: *Socrates* pleadeth for the dispensableness of this Canon; but the people were fain to take *Maximianus*. The Emperour being for dispensing with that Canon, and gratifying the people that had before declared themselves for *Proclus*, did not himself bring him in, but got *Celestine* Bishop of *Rome* to write to *Cyril* of *Alexand.* *John* Bishop of *Antioch* and *Rufus* Bishop of *Theffalonica* to satisfy them to do it; and so got *Proclus* in. What is this against the peoples right? These be all the Doctor's instances on this point.

§. 45. His 5th note is, [*On the alteration of the Government of Christendom there was greater reason for the Magistrates interposing than be-*

fore: Because of Princes endowing Churches, the Royal assent was fit,—though a Bishop was chosen by the Clergy and People.]

Answ. Who would strive against so friendly a disputer, that goeth on to say the same as I? when I doubt his party will say that he Prevaricateth.

§. 46. But he saith, *The Royal power overthrowing the Papal, reserved the power of nomination of Bishops as part of the Prerogative: which being allowed in frequent Parliaments, the consent of the people is swallowed up therein, since their Acts oblige the whole Nation.*

Answ. 1. I see we yet understand not how much of the *Irenicon* is retracted, and whether he yet hold not that no Form of Church-Government is of Divine Institution; or we be not bound to be for that which King and Parliament are for. But we undertake to prove the contrary, and have done it.

2. What if Parliaments gave the King power to chuse all Folks Wives and Husbands, Physicians, Tutors, Diet, Trade, &c. our Right were not swallowed up by this, though it were called the King's Prerogative. Much less where Gods Institution and the very Law of Nature have forestalled them, and neither God nor Man gave them that swallowing power.

3. I oft answered, that Tythes and Temples may be more in the Magistrates power, than Pastoral relation and power of the Keys.

§. 47. He saith, p. 326. *That the inferiour right of Patronage is justly thought to bear equal date with the settlement of Christianity in peace and quietness.*


Answ. 1. It was scarce ever settled in peace and quietness to this day: Much less during the Saxons Heptarchy. 2. I have proved that the Universal Church was far from making Lay Patrons the chusers.

3. It is less lawful to sell our Souls into slavery than our bodies: And if our Ancestors had said to some rich men, *You shall all chuse our Pastors and we will stand to your choice, if you will build us Temples and give them Lands;* it would no more bind us to stand to their bargain, than if they had said, *Give us House and Land, and you shall chuse our Diet, Wives, Physicians, &c.* we say if your kindness be turned to our hurt, take your house and land, or give it to whom you will: we will not sell our souls and Church-rights at such a price.

§. 48. His 6th conclusion is, *That things being thus settled—there is no ground for the people to resume the liberty of Elections.*

Answ. 1. I need not over and over repeat the answer to his reasons. 2. If the liberty of Election be not resumed (which was not that

that which I pleaded for, as he would all along insinuate) yet the liberty of *free consent* or *refusal* may be necessary.

§. 49. Reader, again, the true case is like this following: *Parents* have a ruling power to chuse Wives and Husbands for their Children: Guardians have much power over Orphans in it.  Magistrates may make Laws to restrain unlawful Marriages. Children are bound in these cases to obey Parents, unless they chuse to their apparent hurt or danger; and to obey Guardians and Magistrates in their proper Laws. But 1. It is for all this no Marriage till both parties consent. 2. And all the said power over them is limited, and but directive and not destructive to their own consenting power.

Even so in our case; 1. The Ordainers are the first Judges, and have a power like Parents, and none should be received against their wills, unless they would betray the Church. 2. The Magistrates may make ordering restraining Laws, that no unworthy person shall be tolerated: 3. A limited power of nomination may be left to Patrons, as Guardians, who have power to help the Churches, but none to hurt; much less to ruine them. 4. But it is not a Church related as Pastor and Flock, till both consent. These things are evident truth, though some would bury it in a heap of words.

§. 50. I would also if I could have drawn the Doctor to resolve me this doubt; *Whether the power of Parents and Husbands, or of Patrons, yea or Princes be greater, in the choice of Food, Physick, and so of a Tutor, a Pastor or a particular Church-Communion.* And if a Parent or Husband say, I command you to hear and Communicate with such a Pastor and Congregation, and the Patron say the contrary, yea, or the Prince or Law, which is to be obeyed? And to whom this Family Government most belongeth? And why Father and Mother rather than Prince and Priests are named in the Fifth-Commandment?

§. 51. p. 329. He reciteth my reasons; why Parliaments cannot take away our free Receptive consent, and he again feigneth that I say all this for the peoples *chusing* power, yet confesseth I deny not the Magistrates or Patrons power of their own Gift. (The Case of Sacrilege I leave to their Consciences.)

§. 52. p. 330. But saith he, *Anabaptists, Quakers, and all may pretend a care of their Souls, and so leave the Minister only the Temple and Tythes.*

Ans. 1. And *Anabaptists* and *Quakers* will have a care of their Souls, when you have said and done all you can against it: A prison will not overcome it: 2. So

2. So *Turks, Socinians, Papists*, (or *Anabaptists* if you will) when they get into power, may pretend that they are fitter to be trusted with mens Souls, than men with their own: And so Prelates may say: But is nothing true that men can abuse and misapply?

And to me it is something, though it should be nothing to you,
1. That nature obligeth and disposeth every man more to care for his own soul, than it doth the Patron to care for others. 2. That many hundred or thousand men are not all so like to mistake and miscarry about their own Souls, as one Patron is that is far from their hearts. 3. That it is a matter more dangerous to trust thousands in one hand than in many (as it would be in a storm to put all into one boat.) If that man miscarry he endangereth multitudes: If another man miscarry it is but for one.

3. To have a self-saving power, and to have a self-destroying power, differ (with men that hate not distinction.) So little can a man know what we say by this Doctors Answers, that a stranger would think by him that we were quite of another mind. I never said *Quakers* or any others may have whom they will: If they chuse men uncapable, the neighbour Bishops or the Clergy may admonish them, and renounce his Communion; And the Magistrate may restrain him and refuse to tolerate an intolerable man: And yet the people ought not to accept an incapable man offered by Bishops or Patrons; no nor a man next to incapable when they need and may have much better. Many Negatives are safe.

S. 53. He saith, *The prophane have right to their own souls, and to the care of them, and therefore are equally concerned with others (to chuse.)*

Ans. It is sad with the Church when they need to be saved from such reasonings of their great Teachers.

1. A Right to care for their Souls giveth no man right to chuse men for others Souls, to do that which they will not have done for their own. The question is, whether that man will Communicate with the Church on Christs terms? He refuseth and will not (else he ought not to be refused.) And shall he that refuseth Communion chuse one to give it others, because he hath a Soul himself? Had the neighbour Heathens and Hereticks of old power to chuse Bishops for the Church, while they refused to be of the Church themselves? Shall he that will not be of the Society chuse for the Society?

2. We distinguish between what a man may be forced to, and what not. He may not be forced to the great gift of Sacramental Remission

sion and Communion, because no unwilling person hath right to it : But an ignorant person may be forced as a *Catechumen* or *hearer*, to hear what can be said for his conviction : For truth may conquer the unwilling. But none on this pretense can hinder the Church from hearing its own Pastors, nor force men to be the ordinary Auditors of Mahometans, Hereticks or Heathens.

§. 54. p. 331. He again tragically exclaims of me, on the old false supposition, that I make the people the sole chusers, and not only plead for their free Negative Vote (though chusing also, but not alone, was the old way ;) And here tells us of the tumults that would follow.

Ans. 1. So they would if the people chose in *France, Spain, Italy* : And yet I would they did. No humane actions are free from inconveniencies ; which are not to be cured with a mischief.

2. Let him name me ten places that have suffered so deeply by the peoples choice, as I can tell him of ten thousand that have done by the choice of Prelates, Patrons and Princes, and I will confess my error. It was not by the peoples choice that all preaching was put down in *Moscow* : It is not the people that have this many hundred years chosen all the Popish Bishops, Mass-priests, &c. in *Italy*, and most of the *Roman Church*, even in *Spain, France, Bavaria, &c.*

3. I told him, but had no answer, that not only the Innes of Court, but also *Black fryars, Aldermanbury*, and such other places as have chosen their own Teachers, have (peaceably) had as happy a succession of Learned, Godly, able Pastors, as any place in *London* or in *England*.

4. It's known by experience that Learning and great worth doth as Light so reveal it self to humane nature, that usually most of those that are loth to be holy themselves, would have a Saint and an able man.

5. Doth he think in his Conscience that all the Patrons in *England* are liker to be judicious, and free from solicitations, favour and respect of persons, than the majority of the Communicants of such Churches ?

6. If the Parsons first admit great numbers of profane, and wicked men to be Communicants, and then tell us how unfit these men are to chuse : they do but condemn themselves.

§. 55. p. 333. He tells us we do but say, *We judge, we think, &c. the things unlawful, but for particular arguments to prove them unlawful, he finds none.*

Ans.

Answ. If this be true, then they that never found our arguments never answered them. (If it be not true, it is not well.) Then you here, and Mr. *Falkener, Fulwood, Durel, &c.* have not yet answered any of our arguments. Remember this.

2. Though I did not argue, but name the things in my first Plea, you and others took it for arguing; and we ever craved leave to do it.

3. Is it true indeed, that there are no arguments, in our Writings, 1660. and 1661. with the Bishops, nor any in my Book of Concord, or Treatise of Episcopacy, nor in my old Disputations of Church-Government, nor in any other mens Books these eighteen years? I doubt the angry Bishops will think that in my Treatise of Episcopacy there is some sort of Argument; and that my Book against Sacril. Desertion of the Ministry hath some: and that an Apology for our preaching (now in the Press) hath some. But if there be none, accuse us of none.

C H A P. X.

Of the Imposed use of the Cross in Baptism, and denying Baptism to the refusers.

§. 1. **P**Age 348. He cometh to our [*charge against the Church*] (though he never found any Arguments as aforesaid.)

And I. Why doth he silently balk the chief things which I had named? will this satisfie Conscience? will excusing some things make others lawful?

II. As to what he saith for the Cross, I have so fully answered it twice to Mr. *Cheney*, and once to the *Impleader*, that I am loth to repeat all again. In short, 1. He saith the Church intends it not [*for a sign of Immediate dedication.*]

Answ. 1. What is the *Medium*? 2. What if it were not Immediate? 3. Can it be more Immediate than in the very present dedicating act, to use the sign and expressing the dedicating signification?— 4. The words of the Canon are, [*To dedicate them by that badge to his service, whose benefits bestowed on them in baptism the name of the Cross doth represent.*] And after [*the Church of England accounteth it an honourable badge whereby the Infant is dedicated to the service of him that dyed on the Cross.*] And the service is named [*Christianity in practice,*] to fight under his banner, &c.

2. He saith, [*In baptizing the Minister acts by Authority derived from Christ, but at Crossing he speaks in the name of the Church, [We receive this Child, &c.]*]

Answ. 1. It's meet it should be so, that Christ's Sacraments be used by Christ's Authority, and mens by mens.

2. But I hope this is but a quibble; and that notwithstanding the word [*we,*] the Minister as Christ's Minister, and in his name saith, [*we receive this child,*] when even the absolved are to be received by Christ first, and then by the Church. I will not else aggravate the ill consequences.

§. 2. He before saith, [*Was the Cross a dedicating sign to God, or a declarative sign to men?*]

Answ. The Canon saith expressly twice, [*To dedicate them by this badge to his service—*] And [*an honourable badge whereby the In-*

fant is dedicated to his Service.] And the Rubrick which we must subscribe, refers us to the Canon for the true sense and reason of the Crossing.

2. *Is Baptism and the Lords Supper a sign to God, or to man?* It is a sign to man for God : God knoweth not by signs, but instituteth signs for humane use. It is to dedicate them to God's service.

§. 3. He saith, [*It represents the duty and not the Grace.*]

Ans. 1. The words are, [*to his service, whose benefits bestowed on them in baptism, the name of the Cross doth represent.*] Are the benefits so bestowed no Grace? or is Representing no Representing? or shall we believe the Doctor against the Church? or is this the kind of Conformity that he would teach us, by denying what we subscribe to?

2. Sure the *Cross of Christ with his dying on it*, exprest also in the words of the Canon, is *Grace*. To represent or signifie *Christ dying on the Cross* (which are the words and use) is immediately to represent or signifie the very *Grace of Redemption* it self.

3. To be listed under Christ as the Captain of our Salvation, and to be received into the Congregation of Christs flock, to fight under his banner, &c. are all great Grace.

4. The moral operation on the soul which the preface of the Liturgy ascribes to the Ceremonies, is *Grace* to be wrought by them.

5. To make a common symbol or badge of Christianity, solemnly obliging as a Covenanting sign, by which they must be distinguished from Infidels, and this even at our first Covenanting with Christ, is to make a Sacrament in the old sense. What was the Souldiers *Sacramentum Militare* more, from which the Church seems to have borrowed the name? The Oath was obliging ; The colours or *cingulum* was obliging and a signifying badge : The good received was the *honour, relation* and hope of future pay or preferment upon performance. And is not all this in ours?

6. If you have wit strong enough to justifie all this humane addition to Christs great institution, must all men be compelled to practise as you and such others judge, because you think they do not confute you? Who gave you or such others *right* to silence, reject from Christendom, &c. all such as are not herein of your mind ; even when you deny what your Canon expressly saith?

§. 4. He saith, *It addeth nothing to Baptism which is compleat before.*

Ans. What's this to our question? *It adds another Sacrament to Baptism :*

Baptism: The Lords Supper is another Sacrament of the same Covenant added to perfect Baptism by Christ; and the Cross by men.

§. 5. But all the difficulty is thus removed (he thinks) and by the foresaid quibble of [*I baptize*] and [*we receive*.]

Ans. Difficulties are easilier removed with some men, than with others.

1. He dare not say that the Minister speaks not as from Christ, when-ever he saith [*we*] in the plural number.

2. Doubtless it is first Christs act, and then the Churches to *Receive the Baptized into the flock of Christ*: And the Minister herein first speaketh Christs act and then the Churches.

3. The words [*we receive*] him, goeth before the Crossing and is named especially as part of the Ministrations of Baptism, being its immediate effect. And what a dangerous invention is it to say that the Minister here speaketh not from Christ but the Church, in receiving in those dedicated to him?

4. And he will make us a hard task of it, to know when the Priest speaks as God's Minister, and when as the peoples Minister or mouth?

§. 6. He brings us the instance of one after Baptism, *engaging himself in the Independent Church Covenant by holding up his hand*.

Ans. 1. It is supposed that the Covenant which he mentioneth is not the Covenant of Christianity, but (that supposed) a consent or promise to live in the relation and duty of a Christian member of that particular flock. And this is much like a Covenant between a Christian Man and Wife, Tutor and Pupil: And as men may make particular contracts, they may make particular signs of them, (as is the Ring and taking hands in Marriage; the crowning of a Christian King, &c.) But if you suppose the Independant Covenant to repeat also and contain the Covenant of Christianity it self as the first part, then that which is required is but *signified consent*: And as all Christians renew their consent at each *Eucharist Sacramentally*, so do they frequently by *word and deed*, and all due signification of consent. Nature and Custom of humane converse have made words and gestures signifiers of consent: But Sacraments and solemn badges of this nature signifie by *Institution* of the inventer or imposer.

The sin lyeth in arrogating Christs prerogative, and accusing his Laws of insufficiency. If Christ (by his act and spirit) had not separated one day in seven for the Commemoration of his Resurrection,

he had not told us that this is his own work as *Legislator*. But now he hath separated one day, if man will make a Law that another day also of the week shall be separated to the same use, it is as much as to say, 1. *We have authority to make such Laws as Christ made.* 2. And to amend his Law by this addition. For if it had been fit to be made, there was the same reason then for Christ to have separated two days.

So is it in this case. If Christ had made no Sacraments, we might more have doubted whether he took it for his proper work: But where he hath made two, to make more of the same nature, to me seemeth too bold: He could have made the Sacrament of the dedicating Crofs if he would have had it. If our Bishops should command us to say we believe Christs resurrection, or to stand up to signify it, to avoid confused noise, we refuse it not: But if they would make a Law that none shall be Christened that will not let the Priest put him into a Coffin or Grave and take him out again to represent the Resurrection, I think it safest to deny obedience to such arrogant usurpation.

S. 7. He confesseth, *It belongs to Christ only to appoint the means of conveying his own grace.*

Ans. I have before proved that the Crofs is by this Church appointed as such a means, and named the Grace and conveyance.

S. 8. He saith, [*Though it belong to the King to make the badge or symbol of his own subjects, yet every Nobleman may give a distinct Livery without treason.*]

Ans. True: And this opens the Case. A badge of the Kings subjects is not the same thing, with the badge of a subjects servant: But the Crofs is not the badge of a humane subordinate contract or relation (as City Covenants, or Pastoral particular contracts, &c.) but of Christianity it self, and of the subjects of Christ as such.

S. 9. p. 353. He saith, *Is our worship directed to it or may we kneel before it, as Mr. B. allows men may do before a Crucifix?*

Ans. But if this be not true, or be a deceiving intimation, you should not allow your self to write it. My words are in *Christ. Direct.* q. 113. p. 876. When I had named 21 Cases in which an Image may not be used, (and among the rest, when it is scandalous, or tempting to superstition, &c.) I named many Cases in which an Image may be used; and say [*that it is not unlawful to pray before or towards an Image, in a Room where they are placed only for Ornament, &c.*] Is this to say, (*worship may be directed to it? or that we may kneel before a Crucifix;*) when I had before excepted the Images of God,

God, Christ, &c. in worship, on several reasons? Doth any Protestant doubt of what I assert? My Parlour hath on all four sides the pictures of our living friends: must I not pray in that room because my face will be still towards some of them? Doth he doubt of this? Or is not his citing one half of the words as he doth, to deceive his credulous Reader, if not worse?

S. 10. He saith, *Kneeling before a Crucifix is lawful to him supposing the mind be only excited by it.*

Ans. A Calumny made up by setting together two scraps of remote sentences. 1. Because I say it's lawful to pray in a room where pictures (not any) are before me, for meer ornament, therefore he feigns me to say, *It's lawful to kneel before a Crucifix.* 2. And elsewhere I say, *It is lawful to be excited to a good thought by seeing a Deaths-head, or any of Gods works, and so it is by seeing a Crucifix;* (which no sober Christian doubts of) he feigns me to make it an exciting sign to him that kneels before it.

S. 11. Yea he makes so much use of his own calumny as p. 354. to prove me strangely partial, *Allowing it to be lawful to pray before a Crucifix as a medium excitans, as an object that stirs up in us worshipping affections, and so excuse all Papists from Idolatry that profess they use a Crucifix for no other end.*

Ans. Meer repeated forgery, not becoming his profession. I never spake for praying before it, much less as an object to stir up worshipping affections: But only that I am not bound to fly at prayer from a room that hath only ornamental pictures; and that as in the *Geneva Bible* there be Historical pictures, and few but *Turks* are against them, it is lawful (I say not kneeling before them at prayer, but out of cases of scandal and danger) to be excited by them to good affections, and indeed good affections are worshipping affections. Dare any Christian say that it is a sin to think reverently of God when we see his works, or see but a picture of Scripture History (as *Abraham* offering *Isaac*, *Christ* dying and rising, &c.) Non-conformists have still taken them for *Lyers* that said they were against Historical pictures; and shewed it in the *Geneva Bible*. I have seen in many pious country Houses all the story of *Dives* and *Lazarus* painted over their Tables, and never heard the good use of it accused. But I desire the Reader to peruse my words, which he citeth, *Quest. 113.* and judge with what honesty we are accused. I there say, 1. *It is unlawful to make any Image of God.* 4. *It is unlawful to make, place or use an Image as is like to do more hurt than good, or to tempt to sin:*

sin: — And all such Images of creatures as others use to give unlawful worship or honour to, when like to tempt others to the like ; as among the Papists the Image of the Crucifix, the Virgin Mary and Angels may not be made, placed or used so as may tempt any to worship them sinfully as they do. 11. It is unlawful to place Images in Churches or in secret before our eyes when we are worshipping God, when it tendereth to corrupt the mind — which is the ordinary effect of Images. 12. It is unlawful to use Images scandalously, as any of the aforesaid sinners use them, though we do it not with the same intent : that is, so as in outward appearance is the same with their use, Because so we shall dishonour God as they do, and harden them in sin: Therefore Images in Churches or in Oratories in those Countries where others use them sinfully, or near such Countries, where the same may harden men in their sin, is evil. 21. I think it unlawful to make an Image or any equal instituted sign to be the publick common symbol of the Christian Religion, though but a professing sign (as they make the Cross.)

Doth this doctrine justify the Papists? And p. 876. §. 14. I largely prove the use of a Crucifix (as they do the Cross in baptism) to be unlawful: which he answereth not. Is it not consistent with all this that I say, [*That it's not unlawful to pray before or towards an Image, in a room where Images are placed only for ornament, and we have no respect to them as a medium or object of our worship (except as by accident it's made unlawful.) And that (not kneeling to them, nor in prayer, but, in transient meditation,) it is lawful so to use them historically as to stir up in us a worshipping affection.*] If the Papists do no more, no Protestant would call them Idolaters for it. But if they use them Idolatrously, it makes our use of them unlawful, when even but outwardly it is like theirs: And so I say of the Cross. This is the Doctors zeal against Idolatry, that it seems would have us all used as his Books intimate, till we dare use the Transient Image of the Cross much worse than he maketh the Papists to use Images and Crucifixes in particular. For to use them as a dedicating common badge of Christianity, in our great Covenant with Christ, is more than to use them historically and in meditation, or more than to pray in rooms adorned with common pictures. But he knoweth that the Papists give more to Images.

§. 12. Obj. *But what need had you to say all this of Images?*

Answ. That men may understand it. I'll tell you that you may see the Candor of our accusers. Dr. R. Coxe Bishop of Ely consulted with Cassander to have had Images in our Churches. The Lutherans so use them. Our new Church of England began to set up Crucifixes over Altars, and to plead more for Church-pictures than heretofore. In 1642. the Parlia-

Parliament ordered the defacing all Images of any Person of the Trinity in Churches or Church-yards, (before the King went from them) Because I read this Order and the Church-warden attempted to obey it, the rabble of drunken swearing Journey-men, who were all for Conformity, rose in a tumult with clubs, seeking to kill me and the Churchwardens, and knockt down two Country-men because they were our friends (who carried the hurt to their death:) And the Conforming Clergy were so much for them, that one of them indicted me at the Assizes, and I was forced to leave the Country. Such rage for Images tempted some religious men that were against them, to be more censorious against the Conformists than I would have them, and to run too near the other extrem: And after it grew a dispute whether the *Lutherans* were not Hereticks (of which see *Caspar Streso.*) The remembrance of all this drew me to say all the Truth which I thought useful to cure mens over-much censuring the *Lutherans* and the new Prelatists: And now the thanks they give me is to turn the censure on my self for saying so much to excuse them.

Just so did Mr. *Pierce* by me: My religious neighbours scrupled Communion with their neighbour Prelatists, saying, All the drunkards and swearers and ignorant ungodly people that had no religion, were fierce for Bishops, Liturgy and Ceremonies, and they durst not joyn with them while they profaned the Sacrament. I was far from justifying them, but to abate their overmuch censuring, I told them that in some Countries where custome had brought some particular sin from under disgrace, we could not judge one graceless, whose whole lives else were pious, temperate and just, for sometime committing that particular sin; and it was hard to say how oft this might fall out: As breaking the Lords day in *Geneva* and *Holland*, some petty Oath in some Countries that use it, and such like. For this charity to the Prelatists, what doth Mr. *Pierce* but turn the charge of favouring such gross sin against my self, as if I had been compounding it with godliness?

I leave you all therefore hereafter, better to defend your selves.

§. 13. About their appointing the Cross to work Grace morally, and that Sacraments work it not physically, he saith, *I misrepresent or misapply both the Popish and Protestant doctrine of Sacraments.*] And for the first he saith, *It overthrowes all that I say that they all hold that Sacraments work grace, ex opere operato, where there is no actual impediment, and it's heresie to say, They are bare outward professing signs.*]

Ans. Did he think that this is inconsistent with the opinion that they *work it morally*? They distinguish between the Principal Agent, the instrumental Operator, and the Receiver. And they say that the Sacrament conveyeth Grace by the will of the Principal Agent (God) *ex opere operato*, and hath not its effect *ex opere operantis*; And that *opus operantis* is that which *vim habet ex bonitate & devotione ejus qui operatur*, that is, from the Ministers goodnes (And doth not the *English Canon* say the same?) But *opus operatum* is that which is effectual, *modo fiat sicut lex præscribit*, whether the instrument be good or bad: But it must be *sicut lex præscribit*: And when they come to the Receiver they require in him more than the *opus operatum* to the effect: *viz.* that he intend (as *Aquinas* speaketh, 3. q. 68. a. 7.) to receive Baptism, which is the beginning of a new life, and that he have faith, a. 8. c. *ex parte gratiæ quam quis per baptismum consequitur, exigitur in suscipiente fides, ex parte vero Characteris non necessaria est.* The Character is received without real Faith, but Grace is not. And what that Character is how little they are agreed see at large in *Wotton de Reconcil. Peccat. Durandus*, and the wisest say it is but the Relation of one that hath received the external *tessera* or badge of Christianity (which none deny.) And ad 2. he saith, [*the Church quantum in se, non intendit dare baptismum nisi habentibus rectam fidem, sine qua non est remissio peccatorum. Et propter hoc interrogat accedentes ad baptismum an credant?* And citeth *Austin*, that without true faith it is not received to salvation.

And Art. 9. he concludeth that [*seeing God doth not compell men to righteousness, it's manifest that feigned comers obtain not the benefit of baptism.* And ad 3. *inter fide accedentes*, he numbers them that come in mortal sin, not willing to leave it and be conformed to Christ.

And your own words imply all this, that the Receiver must put no hinderance] while they make the want of necessary intention, desire, true faith, repentance, to be the hinderance, leaving the subject incapable of the Grace of the Sacrament of Baptism.

§. 14. It irketh me to repeat, but you constrain me: *Scotus* and *Okam* (and then I need not say how many more) confute *Aquinas* at large for calling Sacraments so much as Instruments giving Grace, as he explaineth it; And so doth *Pet. Aliaco Camerac.* briefly in 4. q. 1. B. C. concluding that Sacraments are no Causes of Grace properly, but improperly, because *Deus in sacramentis ordinavit sic agere, non quod ipsa sacramenta agant*——And that a sacrament neither by its own virtue, nor by any virtue given it, is any proper efficient cause of any disposition

tion in the soul previous to grace, or of grace it self, but a condition *sine qua non*, dispositiv, improperly called *Causa dispositiva Moralis*, non effectiva sed receptiva: Yet they grant also a Moral objective causality, by signification.

Brianſon in 4. q. 1. fol. 6. concludeth (1. doc.) *sacramenta non sunt gratia causa effectiva, sed solum per modum meriti per ea datur gratia*, citing Ricardus, Scotus, Aureolus, Franc. Perusius, &c. against Thom. & Alexand. herein. Yet saith [*Baptismus indiget fide, quæ est dispositio & fundamentum omnium sacramentorum, vel in se ut in adultis, vel in alio ut in parvulis.* Suarez de Legib. l. 9. c. 6. p. 748. Col. 2. de Circumcis. [*Nam etiam ipsa fides parentum erat conditio necessaria & sine qua non; Et tamen de illa dici non potest, Quod Gratiam daret Infanti ex opere operato, nec quod gratiam contineret; etiam nec causa justificans parvulos dici potest; nisi late & improprio modo, sicut dicitur de quolibet remedio vel conditione sine qua non.*

And Brianſon also saith in 4. q. 4. doc. 1. fol. 34 *Quod fide recipientes baptismum non habent gratiam baptismi, dicunt Scholastici.*

Yea even Hildebrand in one of his Roman Councils concludeth, that the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance give not pardon to the impenitent and incapable.

Petrus à S. Joseph Theſ. univers. de sacram. p. 93. saith, [*Sacramentum est signum sensibile divinitus institutum, longo tempore durans, sanctitatem aliquam, saltem externam (that is, Relative separation to God, which is the true Character with them) conferens, & veram significans.*

And p. 101. [*Sacramenta novæ legis conferunt gratiam, idque ex opere operato & immediate: Duplicem scilicet, aliam respondentem dispositioni, aliam ipsi sacramento: cum antiquæ adultis nullam conferrent nisi ratione dispositionis——Sacramenta novæ legis non producant gratiam physice, sed tantum moraliter.*]

But I must spare the Reader: By this he may understand, 1. That they hold not to the *opus operatum* as efficient of Grace in the Sacraments of the old Law, and so not to Sacraments as Sacraments: 2. That they put *opus operatum* against *opus operantis*, and not against the necessary disposition of the Receiver, which consisteth in Faith, Repentance, intention, &c.

3. That many of them deny all proper Sacramental causality of Grace. 4. Specially Physical. (And Protestants make them not *meer signs*, but *investing signs*.) 5. And *ponere obicem* is to want necessary moral qualification, and action as aforesaid.

And now the Dr. had done well to tell me wherein I was *very much mistaken*.

§. 15. He next saith, [*The Cross is in no sence held to be an instrument appointed for conveying Grace.*]

Answ. 1. Not by God, for it is none of God's Ordinances. 2. But that by men it is I have manifested; if a *moral objective moving and teaching means* may be called an Instrument: If not, the word Instrument is nothing to our case. 1. To work on the soul of the adult by representation, signification, excitation (as the word doth) is to be an operative moral cause or means: And this the Church ascribeth to it (Pref. to Liturg. &c.) 2. The death of Christ, and the benefits of it, and reception into the Church and State of Christianity, and the sense of our Engagement to fight under Christ's banner, &c. are Grace; some of which is given by excitation and some (the Relation) by investiture.

§. 16. And now whether I have only *invented these objections to amuse and perplex mens consciences*, and this Dr. hath made all so plain that all may venture on it, and he and all Ministers may deny them Christendom that dare not venture, and cast out all from the Ministry that be not as bold as he, I leave to consideration.

He next turneth to Mr. A. about bowing, and so goeth to their Excommunication

C H A P. XI.

Whether the Excommunicating Church, or the Excommunicated for not Communicating when Excommunicated be guilty of Schism?

§. 1. **T**Heir Canons excommunicate ipso facto all that say Conformity is unlawful, and many such like. 1. He saith [The excommunication is not against such as modestly scruple the lawfulness of things imposed; but those who obstinately affirm it.

Ans. Reader, trust neither him nor me, but read the words. Can. 3, 4, 5, 6. [Whosoever shall affirm that the Church of England by Law established under his Majesty is not a true and an Apostolical Church, — let him be excommunicated ipso facto.

Whosoever shall affirm that the form of God's worship in the Church of England established by the Law, and contained in the Book of Common-prayer — is a corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful worship of God, or containeth ANY THING in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored till, &c.

Whosoever shall affirm that any of the 39 Articles, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored till, &c.

Whosoever shall affirm that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England by Law established are wicked, antichristian, or superstitious, OR such as being commanded by lawful authority, men who are zealously and Godly affected may not with any good conscience approve them, use them, OR as occasion requireth subscribe to them, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored till he repent and publicly revoke such his wicked errors.

Can. 7. Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the Government of the Church of England under his Majesty by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, and THE REST THAT BEAR OFFICE IN the same, is antichristian, OR repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicate ipso facto, &c.

Can. 8. *Whosoever shall affirm that the form and manner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests or Deacons, containeth ANY THING in it that is repugnant to the word of God;—let them be excommunicate ipso facto, &c.*

Can. 11. *Whosoever shall affirm—that there are within this Realm, other Meetings, Assemblies, or Congregations of the Kings born Subjects, than such as by the Law of this Land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the Name of true and lawful Churches, let him be excommunicate ipso facto, &c.*

And now if the Reader will no more believe the Doctor, it is not long of me. If all this be no more than to excommunicate them that [*obstinately affirm the Ceremonies Antichristian, impious, or superstitious,*] understanding them is not possible.

§. 2. But I confess they excommunicate not men for secret thoughts: We thank them for nothing. It is but for telling their judgment. And Dissenters may have many occasions to tell it. The Kings Commission once allowed some of us to tell it: The Demands, Accusations, calumniating Books and Sermons, &c. may call many to it.

§. 3. He saith, *All Excommunication supposeth precedent Admonition.*

Ans. 1. They should do so: The worse is yours because it doth not so: It only alloweth admonition to repent for his restoration: which made *M. Anton. Spalatensis* say so much against it.

2. If it did oblige you to admonish us, as you have done by your Books, you know that this changeth not our judgments: So that to be excommunicate before the admonition and after comes all to one. But indeed when the Law *ipso facto* excommunicateth, the Law it self is the admonition.

§. 4. He addeth [*General excommunications though they be latæ sententiæ, do not affect the particular persons till the evidence be notorious, not only of the bare fact, but the contumacy.*]

Ans. *Affecting* is a word that signifieth what you please. *Ipsa facto* is [*for and upon the fact proved, without any sentence of a judge.*] While the fact only is thus made the full cause, the contumacy need not be proved. It's true, 1. That the fact must be proved, 2. And then the Law is a sentence and *Relatively affecteth the person as sentenced;* 3. But no persons else are obliged to avoid him, till the fact be lawfully published. But the man is excommunicate. And 4. Whether the man that knoweth the Law and his own Fact be not bound himself to avoid the Churches Communion, is a great Controversie: And the plain truth is, If it be a just Excommunication, he is bound to forbear

Communion in obedience to it: (As much as a silenced Minister is to forbear Preaching.) But if it be a sentence unjust, and injustice be not so gross as to nullifie it, still he must forbear: But if it be so unjust as to be invalid, he may Communicate till he be executively rejected: (As one so unjustly silenced may preach, if he can: for the case is much like.)

The Reader would be displeased if I should cite him many Casuists in so plain a case.

2. But no man doubteth but the General sentence of the Canon speaketh the sence of the Church, and doth all that Law-makers can do, before judgment: And the Law is *norma officii & judicii*, obliging Subject and Judge.

§. 5. It's true that *Linwood* saith, that a *Declaratory sentence*, that is, *A Declaration that such a man is already sentenced by the Law*, is necessary to oblige any to the execution of it on others, or the person in *foro externo*. But still the Church hath done her part in Legislation, to oblige as aforesaid.

§. 6. He saith [*Persons excommunicate are to be denounced so every six months, that others may have notice of them.*]

Ans. 1. But are they not excommunicate then, before they are so oft denounced, yea or at all, as far as aforesaid?

§. 7. He saith [*I have fully answered my own Objection by saying, I am not bound to execute the sentence on my self.*]

Ans. 1. He would not say that he approveth the answer: For if he do, he confuteth himself, that would have us execute the silencing sentence on our selves, and the sentence against publick worship in any way but theirs.

2. My reason is, because I take the unjust sentence as invalid: else I were bound *in foro interiore*.

3. But sure the Church at least relaxeth that mans obligation to present Communion, by shewing her will, if she did not oblige him to withdraw.

Read over the words of the Canon, and see whether they make them not as unintelligible and flexible to what sense they please, as they do the words of the Act of Uniformity and Liturgy.

§. 8. As to his two cases in which the excommunicate may be schismatics for not communicating, 1. We question not the first: Just excommunication excludeth none but the guilty. Here then indeed is the state of our Controversie. Had he proved that in all the cases before cited, it is just to excommunicate us, he had done somewhat, when now for want of it he betrayeth his cause. 2. His

2. His 2d. is [*If they form new Churches.*]

Answ. 1. Is forming new Churches and not communicating with the old ones all one? Our present question is of the later. So that this great Accuser seemeth plainly to absolve all from being bound to Communicate with them, who are unjustly excommunicate, and gather not new Churches.

2. But may not the *unjustly excommunicate* that cannot on just terms be restored, worship God in some publick Church? Doth such a wicked sentence bind men to live like Atheists till death? or deprive them of their right to all God's Ordinances? even many Papist Doctors and Councils say the contrary. And how else do you justify the Church of *England* against the Papists charge of Schism?

§. 9. p. 372. He still seemeth to think, that [*His own and others reasonings may change all the truly honest Christians in the Land to hold all the things imposed lawful.*]

Answ. These thoughts of the Bishops in 1660. and 1661. have brought us all to the pass that we are at; And if after 20 years so great experience of the inefficacy of all their Disputes, yea and Prisons, and after the notice of the nature and different cases of men, they still trust to bring us to Concord on these terms, disputing with such men is in vain; The Lord deliver us from them.

C H A P. XII.

Of the English sort of Sponsors, and the exclusion of Parents duty.

S. 1. **P**Age 380. He saith I [*several times mention this as one of the grounds of the unlawfulness of the peoples joyning in Communion with us: yea as the greatest objection.*]

Ans. Four places of my writings are cited, and all will testifie to him that will read them, the untruth of the Doctors words. This is an unhappy course of accusations: I can find no word of [*The unlawfulness of the peoples joyning in Communion with you on this ground.*] On the contrary, I have taught men how to make this very action in them lawful, *viz.* By getting if possible credible Sponsors of the old sort, and agreeing with them to be the Parents Representer, and promise as in his name, or at least but as his second, undertaking the Education of the Child if he *die* or *apostatize* (which was the old sort:) and himself to be present and signifie his consent by gesture, though he may not speak.

But I have shewed, 1. That this must be done besides the Churches order, that hath no such thing. 2. That subscribing to the Churches order herein is unlawful: 3. That the Church which refuseth the Child lawfully offered, ought not to blame that person that cannot or will not make such shifts, but getteth another Pastor to Baptize him whom they sinfully refuse.

But this is not to prove it unlawful to have Communion with you. But it's lawful to use better also when they can, being thus repulsed by you.

S. 2. He saith [*The Parents are to provide such as are fit to undertake that office.*]

Ans. 1. No one is fit for it as used by the Liturgy, but an Adopter that taketh the Child for his own: For he undertaketh the Parents work. And it's *lis sub judice*, whether any others undertaking besides a Parent or Owner can prove the Child to be in the Covenant as offered, and have right to the seal and benefits: Atheists and Infidels Children are unholy, 1 Cor. 7. 14.

2. If any were fit, few Parents can get such, as will understandingly and deliberately and credibly promise them to do all that Godfathers must by the Liturgy undertake. I never knew one in my life that seemed to the Parent to mean any such thing, much less to do it.

I have in my younger time been Godfather to three or four ; But we before agreed with the Parents to intend no more than to be *Witnesses*, and the Father to be the Entitler and the undertaker.

I did in 1640. Baptize two by the Liturgy, (without Crossing) and never more in 6. or 7. years after, because of the imposed corruptions. Mr. *Kettilby* the Bookseller (unless his Father had another Child of the same name baptized the same year) was one : But his Father gave him his name, and promised all his own duty, and his Uncle and Aunt standing as Sponsors, we before agreed that they should signify but *Witnesses* and friendly helpers in case of need.

2. But what if the Parents are *bid provide such* ? that is no discharge of their own part, nor are they bound to cast their duty on others.

§. 3. He saith (as to the Childs *Right* to Baptism) *that the Godfathers stand* in a threefold capacity, 1. Representing the Parent in offering, 2. Representing the Child in promising, 3. In their own as undertakers of his education, &c.

Ans. 1. I will not till he confute them repeat my proofs that in the Church of *England's* sence the Godfathers are not the Parents representatives at all, nor speak in their name.

2. If they were, then when the Parents both are Atheists, Infidels, Hobbists, scornors at Godliness, Hereticks, the Godfathers can represent them but as they are, and their own faith entitleth not the Child, because they stand in the persons of Atheists, Infidels, &c. your Church doth not like this doctrine.

3. And as to their representing the Child, *quo jure* is the doubt. It cannot be done without some representing power given them. And who gave it them ?

4. And as to the third Person (in this multiform thing) the doubt is, whether their undertaking to educate another mans Child be lawful, while he is bound to do it himself ? 2. And whether men use to be serious in such undertakings, which I never knew one perform, nor seem to mean it, save such as take *poor mens, kinsmens or dead mens children* to keep as their own. 3. And if it be done without serious intention, Is it not to make perjury or perfidiousness, and prophane taking

taking God's name in vain, to be the way of Christening and Covenanting with Christ in order to salvation?

§. 4. This is a great point, and he doth well to handle it diligently: His explication of it is this, p. 382. [1. *The Church hath the power of the Keys, (True; but not as he and the Brownists say, The whole Church, but only the Pastors.)*

[2. *They may baptize capable subjects.*] No doubt of it.

[3. *Infants are capable subjects.*]

Ans^r. But what Infants? All, or some? Is this our satisfaction? If it be *All Infants*, then how come the Heathens Infants to be baptizable and have right, when the Parents have none? Then how great a deed of charity is it to bring an Army among them to baptize their Children by force? When even *Aquinas* and other Papists say, that Children may not be baptized against the Parents wills.

I have elsewhere at large proved, 1. That Baptism is but the sealing of the Covenant, and the delivering of possession by Ministerial Investiture, and not the first gift or condition of our right to Christ and his benefits.

2. That in the Adult faith and Repentance and heart-consent are the Conditions, which Baptism after solemnly expresseth.

3. That if a true penitent believing confenter die without Baptism, he is saved; and if the Baptized adult die without faith, repentance and heart-consent, he is damned.

4. That therefore all the adult must have an entitling condition, to give them right, first initially, *coram Deo*, to pardon of sin, and then to be baptized (which solemnly delivereth their full right) before they can be lawfully baptized.

5. That God dealeth not so differently with Infants and Adult, as to require conditions of right in the later, and none in the former, as if they were all born with right.

6. That the Covenant is made to the faithful and their seed, and that Infants condition of right is that they be children of believers: And that if both Parents be Infidels, the Children are unclean, but else they are holy. And God that confoundeth not the Church and the World, confoundeth not their Childrens case.

This I have fully proved in my Disp. of Original sin, and Treat. of right to Sacraments.

7. That Baptism sealeth and delivereth to the qualified subject, the present pardon of sin, and right to Christ and life as to adopted Children of God. And therefore there must be some reason and

proof of a right to it, more than all Infants in the world have.

8. That it is not a mans bringing them to baptism and speaking feignedly in their name, that giveth them right to a sealed pardon and salvation : It must be one that can prove himself entitled to represent the Child, which none can that cannot say *He is my own*.

9. If it were otherwise, Atheists, Infidels, wicked men, though Baptized, could give no right to the sealed pardon, or to the Investiture in a state of life, to which they have no right themselves. And if they represent no better Parents, as such they can give them no right, save *coram Ecclesia* when they are not *infideles judicati*.

10. Nor doth it suffice to an Infants right, that the Minister, or Church, be Christians.

Therefore to tell us that *Infants are right subjects*, signifieth nothing, till either, 1. He tell us what Infants, 2. Or prove that all Infants have right ; which he can never do : And if he could, I would easily prove that all dying Infants are saved, whether Baptized or not ; As I can prove that true Christian Infants are.

§. 5. While he gives us not the least satisfaction of Infants Right, he tells us of *difficulties* on the other side ; if we lay it on Parents (or Owners) right. And 1. He tells us of divers mens Opinions ; which the Reader will be loth I should digress to try, having done it so largely in my Christ. Direct. and Treat. of *Right to Sacraments*.

2. He nameth the qualification which I assert, [*A profession of the Christian faith not invalidated*] and saith nothing to disable it, but that *Others* will reject it. Others wild Opinions named, goes for my Confutation.

And now I desire the Reader to see the Catalogue of the things we account sinful in Conformity in my first Plea for Peace, and try how many of them the Doctor hath so much as meddled with : And whether he think by these few touches he hath proved either our Conformity lawful, or our Preaching unlawful, or our Communion with those Christians who are not of his mind herein unlawful.

If he say again, that he meddleth not with Ministers Conformity but the Peoples, 1. Note, how he hath passed by even the greatest things also in their case. 2. Whether he meddle not with the Ministers case who seeketh to prove their preaching unlawful, and so perswades them to be silent. 3. Whether their case should not be so far meddled with, as to *prove* the things which they think sinful to be lawful, or their preaching unnecessary ; before the *endeavours* used against them (well known) be justified as needful to the Churches Peace.

C H A P. XIII.

Of the three French Letters which he subjoyneth.

S. 1. **W**Hat advantage to the Drs. Cause the three Letters of the *French* Divines annexed, can be to any that will not be decoyed by meer sounds and shews, I know not: But could we know these things following, we might better understand the judgment of the Writers.

Quest. 1. Whether he that sought their judgment did make them understand what all our present Impositions and Acts of Conformity are? and what alterations are made in the Church of *England* since the beginning of Bishop *Lands* power?

2. Whether he made them truly understand the difference between the ancient Episcopacy, and the *English Diocesan* frame in all its parts?

3. Whether he did put the Case as about Subscribing or Declaring, Covenanting or Swearing, Assent and Consent to all things, and practising accordingly? or only of living in Communion with them which do such things?

4. Whether he put the case as of denying active Communion in the practice of unlawful things; or as denying Communion in the rest which are lawful?

5. Whether he made them understand that we are *ipso facto* excommunicate by their Canon for telling our judgment?

6. Whether he made them understand that it was about 2000 Ministers that were silenced, and what men are in many of their places? and what claim their ancient Flocks lay to many of them; and what men they are, and what they did to prevent all our divisions?

7. Whether he made them understand what measure of Communion we still maintain with the Church of *England* and the Parish Churches?

8. Whether he put the case to them, whether we that have Communion with them are Schismatics, if we also have Communion with others whom they prosecute?

9. Whether he put the question to them, whether we are lawfully silenced? and if not, whether *rebus sic stantibus* we are bound to forbear our Ministry?

10. Whether he made them know that all the Ministers of *England* as well as we were forbidden to Preach, &c. unless they would Conform to that we are ready to prove unlawful? And if it prove so, whether they should all either have sinned or been silent in obedience?

11. Whether he made them understand how many thousands there be in *London* that cannot have room in the Parish-Churches and the Nonconformists Churches set together, but live like Atheists.

12. Whether he acquainted them that the question is, whether all godly dissenters that are cast out, or cannot joyn in the Parish-way of Liturgick Worship, must (till their judgments change) give over all publick worship of God, and be forsaken of all Teachers?

13. Whether he acquainted them, how loud a Call we had to preach in *London*, first by the Plague, & then by the burning of the Churches, the people being deserted by the Parish Ministers in these sad extremities?

14. Whether he acquainted them with the Kings Licences, and our being accused of Schism, even when Licensed?

15. Whether he acquainted them with what we have said for ourselves lately in divers Books; or they judg'd us unheard?

16. Whether they be singular? or whether it be the judgment of the Protestant Churches in *France*, that it is a sin for any to preach or publickly worship God, when the King, Bishops and Law forbid them? And if so, How long it hath been their judgment? and why all their Churches ceased not when prohibited?

If not so, How to know that our silencing Laws and Bishops must be obeyed, and not theirs?

There is no understanding their answers, till we know how the case was stated.

§. 2. Mr. *Glodes* Letter is moderate, and it's like they took the case to be about proper separation, and so say no more in the main than some Nonconformists have said against the *Brownists*. But the Dr. hath dealt too unmercifully with Mr. *Le Moine* in publishing his Epistle, when it was so easie to know how few, if any, would believe his story, but take it for a confirmation, how incredible our accusers are? I mean his story that [*five years ago he heard one of the most famous Nonconformists preach in a place where were three men, and three or fourscore women: he had chosen a Text about the building up the ruins of Jerusalem, and for explication cited Plinny and Vitruvius a hundred times, &c.*] I think I shall never speak with the person that will believe him: sure I am, *London* knoweth that the Nonconformists are the most averse to such kind of Preaching. And I know not one of them that I can say ever read

read a quarter of *Vitruvius*: I confess I never read a leaf of him. This Monsieur would do well to tell us yet the name of the man, that if living he may be call'd to account: But I doubt he fell into some Tabernacle, of which many are erected in place of the burnt Churches, and perhaps heard the Conformist who had occasion to talk of architecture? But yet I will not believe that either Conformist or Nonconformist would expose himself to common scorn by an hundred or twenty such citations.

§. 3. And his description of the mens *horrible impudence to excommunicate without mercy the Church, &c. imagining that they are the only men in England, nay in the Christian world that are predestinated to eternal happiness, &c. and then pronouncing them intolerable*, sheweth that it is not us that he speaketh of, nor any company that is known to us, neither our Separatists here, nor Anabaptists, nor so much as the very Quakers holding any such thing.

§. 4. And though he saith [*He was not at all edified by the Nonconformists preaching*, it followeth not that no others are: Nor that none were edified in *England or Scotland*, while publick Preachers went the Nonconformists way.

§. 5. But because the Doctor chuseth this way, I will imitate him, though with the Apology that *St. Paul* gloried, and give him notice of some Epistles of men that judg'd otherwise of the Nonconformists.

C H A P. XIV.

*Epistles or Testimonies compared with the Doctors,
And notes on Mr. Joseph Glanville's Book, called
The Zealous Impartial Protestant, with a Letter
of his to the Author heretofore (and a Digression of
Doctor L. Moulin.)*

§. 1. **I**N general, he that will read the Lives of many of the old Nonconformists (*Hildersham, Dod*, and many such, and *Bishop Hall's Character of Dr. Reynolds*, and the late published Lives of *Mr. Joseph Allen, John Janeway, Dr. Winter, Mr. Macham, Mr. Wadsworth, Mr. Stubbs, &c.*) will see better what to judge of them, than by our three *French Epistles*. *Yea Thuanus* giveth a juster Character of many abroad that were of their mind: And *John Fox* (one of them) of more.

§. 2. And to our three *French-men*, I will when it will be of more use than *seeming vanity*, return you four *French-mens* Letters to my self, (*Mr. Gaches, Mr. Amyrals, Mr. Le Blanks, and Mr. Testards*, (and if you will some *Germans* too, *Calvinists* and *Lutherans*,) of a quite differing sense of us Nonconformists. But *Mr. Gaches* being already in Print (by the Duke of *Lauderdale's* means) 1660. and joyned with one of *Mr. L' Angles*, I leave the Reader that desireth to see both.

§. 3. But because *Mr. Jos. Glanville* was one of themselves here (though an *Origenist*) a most triumphant Conformist, and not the gentlest contemner of Nonconformists, and famous for his great wit, I will repay the Dr. with the annexing one (among many since) of his Letters to my self; which yet indeed I do not chiefly to ballance the Drs. but to help the Reader to understand *Mr. Glanville* and his posthumous Book, which I think not meet to pass by without some Animadversions.

Though I have great reason to hope that dying so soon after it and his preferment, the experience of the Vanity of a flattering World might help to save him from impenitence: As I have read in divers credible writers, it was with *Dr. Matthew Sutcliffe*; that on his Death-bed

bed he repented that he had written so much against the Reformers called *Puritans*.

I perceive Dr. *Still'ingfleet* marvelleth, that my own expectations of approaching Death do not hinder me from writing what I do for the Nonconformists; whereas the truth is, had not pain and weakness kept me from my youth as in the continual prospect of the Grave and the next life, I had never been like to have been so much against Conformity, and the present Discipline of this Church (that is, their want of Discipline) as I have been; For the World might have more flattered me and byassed my Judgment, and my Conscience might have been bolder and less fearful of sin; And, though I love not to displease them, I must say this great truth, that I had never been like to have lived in so convincing sensible experience of the great difference of the main body of the Conformists from the most of the Nonconformists, as to the seriousness of their Christian Faith, and hope and practice, their victory over the flesh and world, &c. I mean both in the Clergy and Laity of mine acquaintance! O how great a difference have I found, from my youth to this day? Though I doubt not but very many of the Passive Conformable Ministers (to say nothing of the Imposers) have been and are worthy pious men; and such as would not persuade their hearers, that the *Jesuits first brought in spiritual prayer*: And I had the great blessing of my Education near some such, in three or four neighbour Parishes.

§. 4. It grieved me to hear of Mr. *Glanville's* death, for he was a man of more than ordinary ingeny, and he was about a Collection of Histories of Apparitions, which is a work of great use against our Sadducees, and to stablish doubters, and the best mans faith hath need of all the helps from sense that we can get: And I feared lest that work had perished with him; But I gladly hear that by the care of Dr. *H. More* (that worthy faithful man of peace, who never studied preferment) it is both preserved and augmented.

And as for his Origenisme, as I like it not, so I confess in matters of that nature, I can better bear with the venturousness of dissenters, than hereticators can do.

But when I saw this Rag called a Letter left behind him, my grief for him was doubled: And I saw what cause we have all to fear the snares of a flattering world, and what cause to pray for Divine preservation, and for an unbyassed mind, and a humble sense of our own frailty, that we may neither over-value *prosperity*, nor our own *understandings*. I did.

I did not think that he that had wrote the *Vanity of Dogmatizing* could so soon have come to perswade men in power, that dissenting from our *Churches dogmatizing and imposed words, formes and ceremonies* was worthy of so severe a prosecution of us, as he describeth: and that all their danger is from the forbearing such prosecution of us; and that (though for their own ends he could abate us some little matters) the only way to settled peace is vigorously to execute the Laws against us.

He that can think the silencing, and imprisoning of about 2000 such Ministers, is the way to bring this Land to Concord, hath sure very hard thoughts of them in comparison of Conformists. And that you may see how little his judgment against such should weigh with others, who is so lately changed from himself, I will give you here one of several Letters which I had from him, and leave you to judge whether he have proved that he was much wiser at last than when he wrote this? or whether his character of me agree with his motion to silence and ruine all such? I am so far from owning his monstrous praises, that I fear I offended him with sharply rebuking him for them. But lest his wit and virulence here do harm, I give it you to shew the unconstancy of his judgment: or if he would have *excepted me* from his severities, I must profess that *I believe the most of the Nonconformable Ministers of my acquaintance are better men than my self*; and therefore his excessive praise of me, is the condemnation and shame of his persecuting counsel.

§. 5. As to his praise of the Bishops Writings against Popery, I had rather magnifie than obscure their deserts: But I am not able to believe that the old ones who write to prove the Pope Antichrist, &c. and the new ones who would bring us to obey him as Patriarch of the West and *principium unitatis Catholicae*, were of one mind, because both are called Protestants, and that such as Bishop *Bramhall* and the rest of the defenders of *Grotius*, were of the same judgment with Bishop *Usher*, Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Downe*, &c. nor that *Grotius*, who describeth a Papist to be *one that flattereth Popes as if all were right which they said and did*, did disclaim Popery in the same sense as the old Church of *England* did. Two men may cry down Popery, while one of them is a Papist or near one in the others sense.

As to the folly of calling that Popery which is not, I have said more against it in my *Cath. Theologie* than he hath done.

And as to his excuse of an ignorant vicious sort of Ministers because no better will take small Livings,] It is not true: The silenced
Noncon-

Nonconformists would have been glad of them, or to have preached there for nothing: The tolerating of ignorant scandalous men were more excusable, if better were not shut out that would have taken such places. But it's notorious that for the interest of their faction and prosperity, they had rather have the ignorant and vicious, than the ablest and most laborious Nonconformist: Bishop *Morley* told me, when he forbade me to preach, that *It was better for a place to have none, than to have me*; when I askt him, *Whether I might not be suffered in some place which no one else will take.*] Most of the old Nonconformists were suffered by connivance in small obscure places, which was the chief reason why they set not up other meetings, which Dr. *Stillingfleet* thought they avoided as unlawful, because forbidden.

§. 6. And as to his excuse by blaming ill Patrons, I would know then by what true obligation all men in *England* are bound to commit the Pastoral conduct of their Souls to such men only as our *English* Patrons chuse?

§. 7. And when he so blameth the tepidity and irreligiousness of the Members of their own Church, I would know, 1. Whether all men that are more seriously religious must be forsaken by us, and ruined by them, if they be not of their mind and form? 2. And whether the numbers of the irreligious that are for their way, and the numbers of the religious that are against it, should not rather breed some suspicion in them, than engage them to ruine so many such men.

§. 8. And when page 3. he confesseth that the *sword is their Churches strength and Government*, and how contemptible words, paper, arguments and excommunications are without force; doth he not shame their whole cause, and shew that it is not the same Government which the Church used for many hundred years, which they desire? and that their whole power of the Keys which they talk so much for, seems to themselves a dead and uneffectual thing? while we Nonconformists desire no coercive power, but to guide Consenters.

§. 9. As to his project to save religion under a Papist King, if the Dean and Chapter may but chuse the Bishop, I leave it to other mens consideration.

But I give you his Letter to me, because page 34. He saith, *[The greatest part of those that now scatter and run about do it out of Humour or Fancy, or Faction, or Interest, or Animosity, or desire of being counted godly, not really out of Conscience and Conviction of duty: and these the penalties duly exacted would bring back (with much more sharp*

and cruel) As if he knew the consciences of the most: But see how much otherwise he lately thought of some.

Agapetus Diacon. ad Justinian. Adhort. cap. 35. [Episcopis vi & gladio invitos regentibus quam Regibus magis congrua.]

NOMIZE τότε βασιλεύειν ἀσφαλῶς, ὅταν ἐκόντων ἀνάσῃς ἢ ἀνδράπων, &c.
Existima tunc regnare te tutò, cum volentibus imperas hominibus. Quod enim invitò subjicitur, seditiones molitur, captà occasione. Quod vero vinculis benevolentia tenetur, firmam servat erga tenentem observantiam.

1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. The Elders which are *AMONG* you I exhort, who am also an Elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the Glory that shall be revealed; Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; Not for *FILTHY LUCRE*, but of a ready mind: Neither as being Lords over Gods heritage, but being ensamples to the Flock; And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a Crown of Glory that fadeth not away.] See Dr. Hammond on the Text.

Mr. Glanvilles Letter.

*Reverend and most
Honoured Sir,*

‘ I Have often taken my pen in hand with a design to signify to you,
 ‘ how much I love and honour so much learning, piety, and ex-
 ‘ emplary goodness as you are owner of; And how passionately desi-
 ‘ rous I have been, and am, to be known to a person with whom none
 ‘ hath a like place in my highest esteem and value: But my affecti-
 ‘ ons and respects still growing infinitely too big for mine expression,
 ‘ I thought I should but disparage them, by going about to represent
 ‘ them. And when I sat down to consider, how I might most advan-
 ‘ tagiously set forth my regards, and high sense of your great deserts, I
 ‘ always found my self confounded with subject. And the throng of mine
 ‘ affections, each of them impatient to be first upon my paper, hindred
 ‘ one another’s gratification. Great passions are difficultly spoken:
 ‘ And I find my self now so pained with the sense that I cannot write
 ‘ sufficiently to the honour I have for you, that I can scarce forbear throw-
 ‘ ing away my pen; being near concluding, that ’tis better to speak
 ‘ nothing in such a subject, than a little. But when I consider you as
 ‘ a person that have high affections for those excellent qualifications,
 ‘ which in the highest degree are your possession, and sufficiently resent
 ‘ the worth of those that own them; I am encourag’d to think that
 ‘ you may conceive how I honour you (though my pen cannot tell it
 ‘ you) by reflecting upon your own estimate of those, that are of the
 ‘ highest form of learning, parts, and exemplary piety; or, more
 ‘ compendiously, such in your judgment, as I take you for, Incompa-
 ‘ rable. And yet I have a jealousy that that will not reach it; for
 ‘ though I think your judicious esteem of such, cannot be surpassed;
 ‘ yet I am apt to think, that none ever got such an interest, and ho’d
 ‘ upon your passions, as hath the object of my admiration, on mine.
 ‘ Nor yet can I rebuke them as extravagant, though at the highest, since
 ‘ they take part with my severest judgment, and were indeed inflamed
 ‘ by it. And I profess I never found my self so dearly inclin’d to those
 ‘ of my nearest blood, or so affectionately concern’d for my most be-
 ‘ loved friends and acquaintance, as for you, whom I had never the
 ‘ happiness to converse with but in your excellent writings, nor ever
 ‘ often

'often saw, but in the Pulpit. Yea, I speak unfeignedly, I have al-
 'ways interest'd my self more in your vindication when your unrea-
 'sonable prejudic'd enemies have malign'd you, and delighted my
 'self more in your just praises from those that know you, than ever
 'my self-love or ambition could prompt me to do in any case of
 'mine own. Sir, I hope you believe that I speak my most real senti-
 'ments, and do not go about to complement you. For I must be very
 'weak and inconsiderate, did I think to recommend my self to so much
 'serious wisdom, by such childish fooleries. Therefore if my expres-
 'sions favour any thing above common respect, I beseech you to be-
 'lieve, 'tis for that their cause is not common; but as much above
 'ordinary, as their object. I know your humility and remarkable
 'self-denial will not bear to read, what I cannot but speak, as of-
 'ten as I have occasion to mention your great worth and merits. How-
 'ever I cannot chuse but here acknowledge, how much I am a debtor
 'to your incomparable writings. In which, when you deal in practi-
 'cal subjects, I admire your affectionate, piercing, heart-affecting
 'quickness: And that experimental, searching, solid, convictive way
 'of speaking, which are your peculiars; for there is a smartness ac-
 'companying your pen that forces what you write into the heart, by
 'a sweet kind of irresistible violence; which is so proper to your se-
 'rious way, that I never met it equal'd in any other writings. And
 'therefore I cannot read them without an elevation, and emotions
 'which I seldom feel in other perusals. And when you are engag'd in
 'doctrinal and controversial matters, I no less apprehend in them your
 'peculiar excellencies. I find a strength, depth, concinnity, and cohe-
 'rence in your notions, which are not commonly elsewhere met with-
 'all. And you have no less power by your triumphant reason upon
 'the judgments of capable, free inquirers; than you have upon their
 'affections and consciences in your devotional and practical discour-
 'ses. And methinks there is a force in your way of arguing, which o-
 'verpowers opposition. Among your excellent Treatises of this na-
 'ture, your Rational confirmation of that grand principle of our Re-
 'ligion, the Sacred Authority of Scripture; your solid dependent no-
 'tions in the business of justification, and your striking at the Root of
 'Antinomianism in them, which I look on as the canker of Christiani-
 'ty, and have always abhorr'd as the shadow of death; And your ex-
 'cellent Catholick, healing indeavours; These I say, deserve from
 'me particular acknowledgments. I profess the loose, impertinent,
 'unsound, cobweb arguing of the most that I had met with in the
 'Mat-

'Matter of the Divine Authority of Scripture, had almost occasioned
 'my stumbling at the threshold, in my inquiries into the grounds of
 'my Religion. For I am not apt to rely on an implicit faith in things
 'of this moment. But your performances in this kind brought relief
 'to my staggering judgment, and triumph'd over my hesitancy. As
 'they did also to an excellent person a friend of mine, who was sha-
 'ken on the same accounts that I was. And we are both no less ob-
 'liged by what you have done in the other things formentioned. Which
 'I profess I judge so rational, that I cannot but wonder, almost to
 'stupor, to behold the fierce, though feeble onsets of your canker'd
 'fiery opponents; whose writings against you (most of them) seem
 'to me to be indited by nothing but spleen and choler. Nor have I
 'been able to ascribe the ingaging of so many virulent pens against
 'you, to any other cause than the indeavours of Satan to hinder the
 'success which your powerful pen hath had against the Dark Kingdom.
 'And the spirit that I have perceiv'd to animate some of their wild
 'ravings hath confirm'd me in that belief, that it was the great *Abad-*
 '*don* that inspir'd their undertakings. I thought e're this to have gi-
 'ven you a more publick specimen of mine affections by indeavour-
 'ing somewhat in your vindication against the calumnies, and feeble
 'arguings of some of those fiery Assailants; But collateral occasions,
 'and other studies have hitherto diverted me: Yet I shall not forget
 'my obligations, as soon as I can be master of convenient time and
 'opportunities for the performance. But I see my paper warns me;
 'And though I should please myself by a larger expression of my re-
 'spects, and sense of your high deservings from every one that hath
 'had the happiness to be taught by you, either from the Press or Pul-
 'pit; yet I dare not be so rude in this first Address, as to be trou-
 'blesome and importunate. I know your occasions are such, as that
 'they cannot bear a long divertisement. I had several times design'd
 'at *London* to have taken the boldness to have waited on you, but the
 'consideration, how you were constantly engag'd in business, prevent-
 'ed the execution of those intentions. And about three years since
 'I came from *Oxford* on purpose to *Kedderminster*, to see you there,
 'and hear you preach; both which I was happy in. But you were then
 'so busie in the company of several Ministers that were at your house,
 'that I could not gain an opportunity of making way for a future ac-
 'quaintance. If I were sure that you were less incumbred now, and
 'that you made any considerable stay in the Country, I would make a
 'journey on purpose to wait on you. I have with this sent you a small
 'Dis-

' Discourse of mine own, of which I desire your acceptance. For the
 ' subject and design, I know it will not displease you. And for the
 ' management, I'me confident you will not quarrel with it, because it
 ' is not so popular as it might have been, when you shall know, that 'twas
 ' intended for those of a Philosophick Genius. I durst not (Sir) be
 ' any longer troublesome, and therefore shall conclude with this pro-
 ' fession, that the freedom of your spirit, the impartiality of your in-
 ' quiries, the Catholickness of your judgment and affections, the
 ' peaceableness, and moderation of your principles, the generosity
 ' and publick spiritedness of your disposition, the exact, uniform ho-
 ' lines of your life, and your indefatigable industry for the good of
 ' souls, excellencies which I never knew so combin'd in one; have so
 ' endear'd you to me, that there is not that person breathing that hath
 ' such a share in the affections, and highest value of,

*Most excellent Sir,
 one of the meanest, though most sincere,
 of your affectionate lovers, and admirers,*

Sept. 3. 61.

Jof. Glanvill.

CHAP.

C H A P. XV.

Some Notes on the Book called the Lively Picture of Dr. Lud. Moulin; and his Repentance subscribed by Dr. Simon Patrick, Dean of Peterborough, and Dr. Gilb. Burnet.

§. 1. **I** Had taken no notice of this Book, had not the Author by citing my words against Dr. *L. Moulin* as justifying his Character, made me a party. Therefore I shall impartially speak my judgment of him and the accusation, lest I be thought to own all that the Writer speaketh of him, and so to be as guilty of uncharitableness as he seemeth to me to be. I honour the name for the sake of his famous Father, and his worthy Brother *Peter*, yet living, who by his Answer to *Philanax Anglicus*, &c. hath well deserved of all Protestants: And his worthy Brother *Cyrus*, and his very worthy Son now dead: And I truly believe that Dr. *Lewis* was a sincere honest-hearted man, though Dr. *Stillingfleet* seem to dislike my giving him that title. And I will tell you why I think so.

§. 2. I ever observed that his faults lay in his *weakness*, and not in *wickedness*: 1. He was not a man of an accurate distinguishing head, and so was apt to take verbal Controversies for real. 2. And it was no singular thing in him, that hereby he was led by the authorities which he most valued, to think that the differences between the Remonstrants and Contra-remonstrants were much greater than they are, and *Arminianism* as it was called, to be a more heinous thing than indeed it is. 3. And when he thought that God's Cause (as *Bradwardine* called it) was so deeply engaged against such Opinions, who can wonder if he was zealous against them? 4. And then he had a *hasty rashness* in speaking what he thought was true and necessary, when sometimes it was not well tryed, and sometime it was in an imprudent manner and time: And so in his haste ran into the temerities and mistakes which Mr. *Daille* and I did blame him for. But I never perceived that he had more *passion* (much less *fury*) than other ordinary disputers, but a more rash and blustering way of uttering his mind, sometimes and in some Cases, where he thought Religion much concerned. He had so fervent a love to truth, that he sometime rush upon mistakes that

that wore the vizard of it, and then truth (real or supposed) whatever it cost him he would speak. 5. I ever observed it was in his too extreme opposition to some real error or crime, that he was carried into his temerities. 6. And I never found that he was a worldling, nor sinned by the preference of worldly interest; And doubtless the love of worldly profits, honours and pleasures, are more dangerously contrary to the love of God, than some rash uncharitable words and censures in a Cause which he thought was Gods.

§. 3. Yea I found him more patient of confutation, contradiction and reproof than most men that ever I disputed with, his Zeal which you call *fury* being far more for God than for himself. I began with him about 24 years ago, confuting his Latine Book of Justification against his Brother *Cyrus*. I wrote a second time against him in the Preface cited by his Picture-drawer, about Universal Redemption, (and had said much more in a Book of Universal Redemption, going to the Press, which I cast by because Mr. *Daille's* came then out, which had the same testimonial part and more which I intended.) Yet I never heard that the Dr. gave me any uncivil or uncharitable word, nor did he ever reply to either of these Books; nor signified any abatement of his love. And I think this shewed a forgiving mind.

§. 4. But it's intimated, that this was because we agreed in other things? I answer, we disagreed also even about Church-Government, which was the dividing Controversie of those times. The Dr. was zealous for the Magistrates Power in *Erastus* sense, and went rather further than Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*: And as I was before against him, so after this, about 12 years ago, I wrote that Book against him about the Magistrates Power in Church-matters, in which I called him *My sincere friend*, thinking *sincere friendship* consistent with such a difference and an open Confutation. (And if the contrary must be repented of, I hope such charity is no crime.) This third Book against him also he took patiently, and without breach of Love.

And when I laboured to perswade him to retract his Writings against Excommunication, though he held still to his Conclusion, and thought that the great work that God called him to in the World, was to discover the Papal and Prelatical Usurpation of the Magistrates power under the name of Ecclesiastical, yet I made him confess all the matter that I pleaded for, and he made me see that his error lay most in meer ambiguous words, which he had not accurateness enough to explicate. All this patience signified not uncharitableness, rage or fury. And I obliged him not by benefits or praise, but usually chid him

him for his eagerness for his own indigested conceptions ; nor gave him any thanks for his indiscreet and excessive praises afterwards given me in his *Patronus bonæ fidei*. Upon all this I would put some questions to the sober thoughts of the Author of his Picture.

1. Whether there be not as great signs of *sincerity*, *humility* and *patience* in such a behaviour, and in that great love which he had to all that he thought Godly men, (though he too hardly judged of others for that which he thought great error and sin) as in those that cannot bear a just defence of dissenters against their unjust accusations, nor endure men to tell why they rather suffer than Conform.

2. Whether he that maketh him so very bad a man * and incredible a liar for too rash censoriousness of dissenters, and some untruths vented in rash zeal, do not tempt men to give as odious titles to those Reverend persons who go very far beyond him in untruths and uncharitable censures? And whether they that were for the silencing and utter ruining of about 2000 Ministers, and call'd to Magistrates to execute the Laws against them, and that unchurch all the Reformed Churches which have not a continued succession of Diocesan Bishops, shew not as much uncharitableness as he did that described some too hardly? And whether most of the Books written against me by Conformists, (such as the Bishop of *Worcester's* Letter, the *Impleader*, Mr. *Hinkley*, and many more) be not much fuller of untruths in matter of fact than the Drs? But yet I think it a sin to give them such a Character as this, and render the persons as *incredible liars*, because error, interest and faction made some so unadvised.

* Page 22 A vain Writer and malicious, if not mad and distracted. p. 11. he will magnifie the very worst of men, if they be of his mind, and vilifie the best if they be of another. p. 27. He hath full liberty to vie with the Devil himself in his Calumnies: with more such.

3. If it deserve such a Character to censure *Arminians* as dangerously erroneous and befriending Popery? whether you do not consequently so stigmatize the old Church of *England*, before Bishop *Laud's* time? Even Arch-bishop *Whitgift*, Bishop *Fletcher*, and the rest who drew up the *Lambeth Articles*, Arch-bishop *Abbot* and the Church in his time (except six Bishops, &c.) King *James*, and the whole Church as consenting by six Delegates to the Synod of *Dort*: And also that Synod and all the Foreign Reformed Churches that consented to it? And is not this more than Dr. *Moulin* did?

4. And are they not then to be accordingly stigmatized, who on the other side make the *Calvinists* as odious, accusing them of Blasphemy,

my, Turcisme, and doing as much against them as Dr. *Heylin* in the Life of Arch-bishop *Laud* tells us was done in *England* on that account.

5. And if such hard thoughts of *Arminians* as furthering Popery deserve your Character, whether by consequence you so brand not all those Parliaments who voted against it accordingly, and made it one of the dangerous grievances of the Land? And is not that as faulty as for Dr. *Moulin* too much to blame you?

6. Yea I doubt you stigmatize thus so great a part of Christians in all the World as I am loth to mention: so rare is it to hear of any Country, where they are not so much guilty of sects and factions, as by education and interest to run in a stream of uncharitable censures of one another, speaking evil of more than they understand, as I have proved in my *Cathol. Theolog.* about this subject.

7. Seeing it is above 20 years since I wrote that against Dr. *Moulin* which you cite, and he never found fault with it, nor justified his mistakes, may I not think that he was convinced and repented? And you that praise his death-bed repentance, should not Characterize him by failing twenty years repented of?

8. How do you know that the Dr. repented not of his too hard words of you till his death-bed? You are mistaken? In his health I more than once blamed him, 1. For his censure of Dr. *Stillingsfleet* and the other particular persons, whose worth was known, and had deserved well of the Protestant Churches; 2. For his extending those censures to the Conformists and Church which belong to some particular persons, and the most are not guilty of, And 3. For his Book of the *fewness* of the *saved*, as presumptuous: And as far as I could then discern he repented of them all, but laid the ill Title-page of the last on the Book-seller: And he still thought of Causes and Parties as very different, he owned not his harsh words or censures aforesaid. I found him not *raging* nor *impenitent*.

9. Doth not your own description of his great readiness to beg forgiveness, and lothness to own any thing uncharitable, shew a better spirit than your *picture* doth describe?

10. Is not he as like to be a sincere man who asketh forgiveness of his faults (rash censures and words) as he that repenteth of his former duties, his Pacificatory principles and Writings. Surely to repent of evil is a better sign than to repent of good.

11. Because you call us to acquit our selves by disowning Dr. *Moulin*, may we not disown both his faults and our own, without disowning

ing God's grace and mens piety and worth? would you be so disowned for your own faults? 2. And how should I disown his rashness better than to write what I wrote against him, and say what I said to him? would you have a Synod called to reprove every rash word?

12. Because you justly value mens repentance, I will be thankful to you to further mine, and give me leave to further yours. Only I foretell you that your words shall not offend me by their hardness, if they have but truth, and you call me to repent of my sin and not of serving God. I do not repent of defending Truth and Duty: nor of seeking to save the Reader from the infection of false accusation and arguings which would destroy his charity and innocency, by the fullest manifesting the *falsehood* and *evil* of the words and deeds which are the Instruments. I take it to be a wrong to those that I would preserve, to extenuate the danger of the snare or poyson, on pretence of gentleness to the Writer. But I deal with the Cause and desire none to hate the person: nor would I diminish the honour due to him for his parts or vertues; but rather have all men love and magnifie all the good, while they dislike the evil; and would save the Reader at as easie a rate to the Writer as I can: But that he should not be related to his false or sinful words or deeds is not in my power to effect. But though I repent not of necessary truth, if I any where mistake, or speak more truth than is profitable, or in language by sharpness more apt to do hurt than good, of this I repent, and ask forgiveness of God and man; As I do if I speak so short of truth, as with *Eli* to make sin seem smaller than it is.

And now I hope you will love your own duty of Repentance better than another mans, and will not be angry if I seek to help it.

1. Do you not perceive that while you paint the Dr. as an incredible raging distracted lyar, and praise his repentance for *rash words* of others, that you commit the same rashness your self against him? If you cannot see your own face, let any impartial Reader be your glass, and ask him whether you do not that which you are condemning?

2. You seem to vindicate the Book called the *Friendly Debate*, I shall shortly further tell you of somewhat in it to be repented of. And if partiality made not repentance a very difficult work you would have no need herein of a Monitor. But you may think me partial, though I acknowledg your civilities to me: I can shew you a Manuscript of one both impartial and truly judicious, even the late Judge *Hale*, expressing so great dislike of that Debate and the Eccl. Policy, as tend-

ing to the injury of Religion it self, that he wisheth the Authors would openly profess that they write for themselves, and no more so abusively pretend it is for Religion.

3. You say in this Picture that [*If L. du Moulin had that honest zeal in him to which he pretends, he would have handled Mr. Baxter as smartly, &c.*]

Ans. There may be other reasons than want of *honest zeal*: But do you not here shew that it is the *persons* more than his *act* that offended you in his reproof? Could you judge it *honest zeal* had it been to others? *pag.* 16.

4. You say, *p.* 17. He hath something of the Nonconformists in him, and for that reason he spareth him:

Ans. Do not Nonconformists differ from *Erastians*? Did not I write against his opinion of Church-Government? And did he not bear 22 years ago when Conformity was not in our Controversies.

5. You say of [*the party that come nearest the doctrine of Calvinists and Puritans, (though you say you mean such as D. M. your Reader must suppose you mean the Nonconformists) that (they are the true Causes of all our present evils. — For the late War was raised, — by the very best of you, &c.)*] If you mean, as you seem, it's somewhat extraordinary to persuade men to believe this in the same Land and Age that the War was raised in; And for one to do this that had the first General of the Horse in the Earl of *Essex* Army, his Patron a few doors from him, and the Lord *Hollis* a Colonel nearer him till lately, and the Lord President of his Majesties Privy-Council a Colonel not far off him, and many more known Conformists, who could all quickly have satisfied him how few Nonconformists were Members of Parliament or Commanders in the Army when the War began, and that it was betwenn two parties of Conformists that the Wars began, as I have proved against Mr. *Hinkley*, and can fullier do when there is need. Which party is most obliged to repentance you may dispute with those that are fit for it. But if your intimation be untrue, it is of another nature, and degree than any of Dr. *Moulins*. I confess one party did in many Parliaments before, and in that, accuse Bishop *Laud* and his new followers, 1. Of Innovations, 2. Of Arminianism, 3. Of promoting absolute arbitrary Government against the Subjects Property and Liberty, 4. And of promoting Popery. But if this party were not Conformists of the Church of *England*, the Bishops, Clergy and Gentry were not the Church in Arch-bishop *Abbots* days before Bishop *Laud*.

As to the Reasons of their accusations, and the publishing the Articles for Toleration in order to the *Sp.* and *Fr. Match*, &c. I pass them by. But because you may say some such think of me as you do of *D. M.* for what I say in my *search for the Schismaticks*, I only add, 1. That I hope we may transcribe mens own words, 2. And may judge that there is some difference between the Bishops that judged the Pope Antichrist, &c. and those that would have us as the way to unity, to obey him as Patriarch of the *West*, and *principium unitatis*, and the first 6 or 8 General Councils, and that say our concord must be in obeying *unum Collegium Pastorum*, ruling the whole Church *per literas formatas*, and that say the *Roman* Church is a true Church, but so are none of the Reformed that have not Bishops, and a continued successive Ordination by such.

A Copy

A Copy of a Letter written by Mr. *Lewis Du Moulin* to the Worthy Dr. *Tho. Coxe* ; With the Drs. Answer occasioned by some Reports that concerned Dr. *Lewis Du Moulin*.

Worthy Sir,

K Nowing the natural inclination you have to oblige all men and the particular experience I have of your unwearied goodness to my person and family did incourage me to write both before and now ; The occasion of both was the Reports spread abroad of my Father, being informed you had made him the object of your Care during his sickness, I rejoiced that Providence had ordered it so that a Person of your approved worth and Integrity was concerned about him. I shall not trouble you with the Relations Fame has brought into this Country, but shall only desire to know how he died ; Was there any advantage taken of his weakness of body or mind ; How far did his Reported Recantation extend ? Reach'd it to any material thing of his Tenets, or only in reference to personal Reflections ; This is what is humbly desired by,

Honoured Sir,

Your most Humble and obliged Servant,

Lewis Du Moulin.

From my House at *Malton*
in *Yorkshire*, *October*
the 7th. 1680.

The

The Drs. Answer to Mr. Lewis Du Moulin.

Sir,

I Had not delayed to return an Answer to your first Letter, had I known how to direct mine to you, which indeed I had forgotten how to do; This is therefore to let you know that your Father (my honoured Friend) Dr. Du Moulin, Dyed as he had Lived, a trulypious man, a great hater of the Romish Superstition, and of so much of the English Ceremonies as he thought approached those of Rome; He loved all good men of what persuasion soever, agreeing in the Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion. When some worthy and Learned men did on his Death bed intimate to him that he had saln too heavy upon many Pious and Learned men of the Church of England: He professed himself never to have born any malice in his heart against the Person of any of them, but that his intention was only to blame them for having too much gratified the Enemies of the true Protestant Religion, by their condescensions to them, and their too great compliances with them: He never recanted nor retracted any thing material that he had Professed and Printed of late years; if he had used any sharp expressions, or by any reflections given any offence to any truly pious man, he heartily prayed their pardon, and as heartily forgave all men, as he desired them to forgive him. And this he had often before expressed to me both in publick at my House, and in private between himself and me, and also after that some worthymen had been with him, which gave occasion to this discourse. This for your satisfaction is with truth and sincerity attested by

Your Affectionate Friend

Tho. Coxe.

London, Octob. 29.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

Five Additional Notices to the Reader.

THere are some things of which I thought meet to add this notice to the Reader.

I. That I am more alienated from Conformity in the point of *Assent, Consent and Use*, in denying Christendom to all Children who have no Godfathers and Godmothers, and excluding the Parents from that Office, by some late Observations which my retiredness kept me unacquainted with : I am requested by some poor People to Baptize their Children : I tell them the Parish Ministers must do it. They answer me, That they cannot have them Baptized by the Parish Ministers, because they are poor; and can neither pay the Curate nor the Godfathers : I ask them, *Cannot you get Godfathers without money* : They say, *No: No body will be Godfather to their Children for nothing* ? Whereupon enquiring into the case, I am informed, that among the poor it is become a trade, to be hired persons to be Godfathers and Godmothers ; and some that have not money must leave their Children unbaptized, and till lately, Popish Priests Baptized many. I am not willing to aggravate this *Hiring*, nor the *causes* of it, nor that the same men that think Baptism necessary to Salvation, (or as Mr. Dodwell speaks, to a *Covenant right to Salvation*) should yet shut out all that have not money to hire such Covenanters ; But I am not Conformable to such Church-Orders.

II. Whereas there is a great stress laid on Mr. Rathband's Book of the old Nonconformists Doctrine against the *Brownists*, as if they thought that meer obedience to the Law required them to forbear Preaching when they were silenced, when indeed they only thought,
1. That it bound them to give up the Temples and Tithes and publick maintenance (which are at the Magistrates dispose,) 2. And to forbear that *manner* and those *circumstances* of their Ministry as no Law of God in Nature or Scripture do oblige them to, but
will

will do more hurt than good ; I have now for fuller satisfaction, here added the Testimony of his Son concerning his judgment and practice : who nineteen years had his liberty in *Lancashire* to Preach publickly, in a Chappel, and after that in *Northumberland*, and no wonder if the disorders of *Brownism* that would have deprived them of all such liberty were opposed. I have perused Mr. Rathband's Book (written by some others) and I find nothing in it that I consent not to, but desire him that would understand it to read the Book it self.

Mr. Rathband's Letter to me is as followeth.

- Reverend Sir,

W Hereas Doctor Stillingfleet in a late Book of his hath alledged a Book published by my Father, to prove that Preaching contrary to our Established Laws is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Nonconformists in former times, I assure you, Sir, that my Father is not to be reckoned in that number; for he exercised his Ministry, though contrary to the Law, for many years at a Chappel in *Lancashire*, and after he was silenced he Preached in private, as he had opportunity and the times would bear; of which I my self was sometime a witness. Afterward, upon the invitation of a Gentleman, he exercised his Ministry at *Bellham* in *Northumberland*, for about a year, and from thence he removed to *Ovingham* in the same County, where he Preached also about a year, till being silenced there, he retired into private as formerly. This I thought expedient to signifie to you, and you may make what use of it you please, for what is written here shall be owned by

SIR, Yours in all Christian respects,

William Rathband.

London, April 2.
1681.

(He is a Grave and worthy Nonconforming ejected Minister, living usually in *High-gate*.) His Father read part of the Common-Prayer, and kept in as aforesaid.

And I thank Doctor *Stillingfleet* for so full a Vindication of such old Nonconformists against the Accusations of their Prosecutors.

III. When my Book was almost Printed, I received the Manuscript of a faithful Learned ejected Minister, in which, he manifesteth the fallacy of Doctor *Stillingfleet*'s Allegations of History for the Antiquity of Diocesan Bishops, and fully proveth that for the first three hundred years the Bishops were Congregational and Parochial, and that with so full evidence, as that out of *Strabo* and other Geographers he sheweth that many of their Seats were but about four Miles from one another, as our Parish Churches are; and he confuteth what is said against it. And he sheweth the Doctors gross abuse of History, to prove that Bishops needed not the Peoples consent, and proveth that the Peoples choice or consent was necessary by the constant judgment of the Churches.

But this Book is of so great worth, that I will not dishonour it by making it an Appendix to mine, but intend to make so bold with the Author, as to publish it by it self.

1. As a fuller Confutation to Doctor *Stillingfleet*.
2. As a full Answer to Mr. *Dodwell*'s Letters on that subject;
- And 3. As a Confirmation of my full proof of the same things, in my Treatise of Episcopacy.

IV. And if any will receive that from a Conformist, which he will not receive from such a one as I, he may read,

1. Our full and faithful Vindication by a *Beneficed Minister*, and a *Regular son of the Church*, Called *A Compassionate Consideration of the Case of the Nonconformists*: I am not so happy as to know the Author, but he confirmeth my former Judgment, that a great part of the Passive Conformists are moderate worthy men, with whom we should earnestly endeavour as near and fast a coalition as is possible to be had by lawful means.

2. And either the same hand, or such another Conformist, hath written Reflections on Doctor *Stillingfleet*, in which the like candor and charity appeareth, though with some excess of kindness to me.

V. With this Defence against Doctor *Stillingfleet*, I at once publish in another Volume, *An Apology for the Nonconformists Preaching*, with an Answer to a multitude of their Accusers, and Reasons to prove that it is the Bishops and Conformists great *Duty and Interest* to seek their Restoration. Which is the most material part of the Confutation of Doctor *Stillingfleet*, who would persuade us that our Preaching is a sin, and make us guilty of silencing our selves.

FINIS.

*Books lately Printed for Nevil Simmons, at the Three
Cocks at the West-end of St. Pauls.*

1. **C**HURCH-History of the Government of Bishops and their Councils abbreviated ; Including the Chief part of the Government of Christian Princes and Popes, and a true account of the most troubling Controversies and Heresies till the *Reformation*. Written for the use especially of them ; 1. Who are ignorant or misinformed of the state of the Ancient Churches. 2. Who cannot read many and great Volumes. 3. Who think that the Universal Church must have one visible Sovereign, Personal or Collective, Pope or General Councils. 4. Who would know whether Patriarchs, Diocesans, and their Councils, have been, or must be the Cure of Heresies and Schisms. 5. Who would know the truth about the great Heresies which have divided the Christian World, especially the *Donatists, Novatians, Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, &c.*

2. A Treatise of Episcopacy ; ~~Consisting~~ by Scripture, Reason, and the Churches Testimony, ~~that sort of~~ *Diocesan Churches, Prelacy, and Government, which casteth out the Primitive Church Species, Episcopacy, Ministry and Discipline, and confoundeth the Christian World by Corruption, Usurpation, Schism, and Persecution.* Meditated in the Year, 1640, when the *Et-cetera* Oath was imposed. Written 1671. and cast by. Published 1680. by the importunity of our Superiours, who demand the Reasons of our Nonconformity.

3. A Moral Prognostication, 1. What shall befall the Church on Earth, till their Concord, by the Restitution of their Primitive purity, simplicity, and Charity. 2. How that Restitution is like to be made, (if ever) and what shall befall them thenceforth unto the End, in that Golden Age of Love. All three by *Rich. Baxter.*

4. *Memorabilia* : or, The most Remarkable Passages and Counsels, Collected out of the several Declarations and Speeches that have been made by the King, his Lord-Chancellors and Keepers, and the Speeches of the Honourable House of Commons in Parliament ; since his Majesty's happy Restauration, *Anno* 1660. till the end of the last Year, 1680. Reduced under four Heads ; 1. Of the Protestant Religion, 2. Of Popery. 3. Of Liberty and Property, &c. 4. Of and charity. By *Edward Cooke, of the Middle-Temple, Esq;*